THE MESSAGES AND PAPERS OF WOODROW WILSON

VOLUME II

THE MESSAGES AND PAPERS OF WOODROW WILSON

Woodrow Wilson

WITH EDITORIAL NOTES
AN INTRODUCTION BY
ALBERT SHAW AND AN
ANALYTICAL INDEX

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOLUME II

NEW YORK
GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT TYLER
LIBRARY

Copyright, 1917
By The Review of Reviews Co.

Copyright, 1918
By The Review of Reviews Co.

Copyright, 1924
By The Review of Reviews Corporation

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT TYLER
LIBRARY

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II

PAGE

Addresses at Peace Conference:

At Opening Session 614
January 18, 1919

On League of Nations 618
January 25, 1919

Presenting Report on League 623
February 14, 1919

Address on Return from Europe 638
Boston, February 24, 1919

Address at New York City 647
March 4, 1919

Statement on Italian-Jugoslav Dispute 659
April 23, 1919

Presenting Revised Covenant to Peace Conference . 663
April 28, 1919

Address before International Law Society . . . 667
Paris, May 9, 1919

Message to Special Session of Congress 671
May 20, 1919

Address at Dinner to President-Elect of Brazil . . 682
Paris, May 27, 1919

Address before Belgian Parliament 686
Brussels, June 19, 1919

Statement Praising Treaty of Peace 692
June 28, 1919

PAGE

Address on Return from Second Trip to Europe . . 694
New York, July 8, 1919

Address to Senate, Presenting Peace Treaty . . . 698
July 10, 1919

Address to Congress, on the Cost of Living . . . 713
August 8, 1919

Addresses on Western Tour, Discussing the League of Nations and Treaty of Peace:

At Columbus, Ohio 727
September 4, 1919

At Indianapolis, Ind. 743
September 4, 1919

At Hotel Statler, St. Louis, Mo. 754
September 5, 1919

At Coliseum, St. Louis, Mo. 767
September 5, 1919

At Kansas City, Mo. 777
September 6, 1919

At Des Moines, Iowa 788
September 6, 1919

At Omaha, Neb. 803
September 8, 1919

At Sioux Falls, So. Dak. 816
September 8, 1919

Before Minnesota Legislature, St. Paul 828
September 9, 1919

At Auditorium, St. Paul 844
September 9, 1919

PAGE

Addresses on Western Tour, Discussing the League of Nations and Treaty of Peace (cont'd):

At Bismarck, No. Dak. 856
September 10, 1919

At Mandan, No. Dak. 866
September 10, 1919

At Billings, Mont. 867
September 11, 1919

At Helena, Mont. 878
September 11, 1919

At Cœur d'Alene, Idaho 900
September 12, 1919

At Spokane, Wash. 911
September 12, 1919

At Tacoma, Wash. 924
September 13, 1919

At Seattle, Wash. 936
September 13, 1919

At Portland, Ore. 955
September 15, 1919

At Palace Hotel, San Francisco 966
September 17, 1919

At Auditorium, San Francisco 979
September 17, 1919

At Palace Hotel, San Francisco 993
September 18, 1919

At Oakland, Cal. 1005
September 18, 1919

At San Diego, Cal. 1014
September 19, 1919

PAGE

Addresses on Western Tour, Discussing the League of Nations and Treaty of Peace (cont'd):

At Los Angeles, Cal. 1037
September 20, 1919

At Reno, Nev. 1050
September 22, 1919

At Salt Lake City, Utah 1067
September 23, 1919

At Cheyenne, Wyo. 1084
September 24, 1919

At Denver, Colo. 1101
September 25, 1919

At Pueblo, Colo. 1113
September 25, 1919

Call for a National Industrial Conference . . . 1131
September 17, 1919

Appeal to the Industrial Conference to Agree . . 1131
October 22, 1919

Statement on the Wrong of a Bituminous Coal Strike 1133
October 25, 1919

Statement on First Anniversary of Armistice Day . 1136
November 11, 1919

Seventh Annual Message to Congress 1138
December 2, 1919

Proposal to Striking Bituminous Coal Miners . . 1152
December 6, 1919

Appointing a Commission to Investigate Bituminous Coal Industry and Arrange a New Wage Agreement 1155
December 20, 1919

PAGE

Proclamation Relinquishing Government Control of Railroads 1159
December 24, 1919

Criticizing Senate Attitude Toward Peace Treaty . 1161
January 8, 1920

Calling First Meeting of the League of Nations . . 1165
January 13, 1920

Letter to Senator Hitchcock Accepting His Peace-Treaty Reservations 1166
January 26, 1920

Diplomatic Notes Regarding Fiume and the Adriatic 1168
February 9—March 4, 1920

Diplomatic Note Regarding Constantinople and Turkey 1183
March 24, 1920

League of Nations as a Campaign Issue 1187
May 9, 1920

Insisting That There Shall Be No Anthracite Coal Strike 1189
May 21, 1920

Message Urging Acceptance of Mandate Over Armenia 1191
May 24, 1920

Veto of Resolution to Declare Peace with Germany and Austria-Hungary 1195
May 27, 1920

Condemning Congress as Actuated by Political Expediency 1198
June 5, 1920

Urging Tennessee to Act Upon Woman Suffrage . . 1199
June 23, 1920

PAGE

Urging Bituminous Coal Miners to Abide by Agreement 1200
July 30, 1920

Insisting That Anthracite Coal Miners Accept Award 1202
August 30, 1920

Appeal to Make the Election a Referendum on the League of Nations 1204
October 3, 1920

Address to Pro-League Republicans 1207
October 27, 1920

Accepting a League Invitation Regarding Armenia . 1211
November 30, 1920

Eighth Annual Message to Congress 1212
December 7, 1920

Refusing to Submit Railway Wage Demands to Congress 1220
February 6, 1921

Message Asking Fulfillment of a Pledge to Belgium . 1222
February 21, 1921

Veto of the Emergency Tariff Bill 1224
March 3, 1921

Article Contributed to "The Atlantic Monthly" . . 1229
August, 1923

Radio Address on the Eve of Armistice Day . . . 1232
November 10, 1923

Notable Phrases of Woodrow Wilson 1235

Index 1239

PREFACE

The first volume of these presidential messages, addresses and state papers of Woodrow Wilson included his two inaugural addresses, six annual messages to Congress, the war message and the diplomatic notes that led up to it, speeches in England and Italy, and nearly a hundred other official utterances.

This second volume finds the President in Europe, at the opening of the Peace Conference, as head of the American commissioners. It includes his addresses at the Peace Conference, speeches in France and Belgium, two annual messages to Congress, the address to the Senate presenting the Peace Treaty for ratification, and numerous other documents. Especially, however, this volume presents the series of speeches made by the President, in the western part of the United States, in support of the Peace Treaty and the League of Nations. It carries the printed record of presidential messages, addresses and state papers down to the end of Woodrow Wilson's career.

WOODROW WILSON ADDRESSES OPENING SESSION OF THE PEACE CONFERENCE

JANUARY 18, 1919

Mr. Chairman:

It gives me great pleasure to propose as permanent chairman of the conference M. Clemenceau, the president of the council. I would do this as a matter of custom. I would do it as a tribute to the French Republic. But I wish to do it as something more than that. I wish to do it as a tribute to the man. France deserves the precedence not only because we are meeting in her capital and because she has undergone some of the most tragical sufferings of the war, but also because her capital, her ancient and beautiful capital, has so often been the center of conferences of this sort upon which the fortunes of large parts of the world turned. It is a very delightful thought that the history of the world, which has so often centered here, will now be crowned by the achievements of this conference. Because there is a sense in which this is the supreme conference of the history of mankind. More nations are represented here than were ever represented in such a conference before. The fortunes of all peoples are involved. A great war is ended which seemed about to bring a universal cataclysm. The danger is passed. A victory has been won for mankind, and it is delightful that we should be able to record these great results in this place.

But it is the more delightful to honor France because we can honor her in the person of so distinguished a servant. We have all felt in our participation in the struggles of this war the fine steadfastness which characterized the leadership of the French people in the hands of M. Clemenceau. We have learned to admire him, and those of us who have been associated with him have acquired a genuine affection

for him. Moreover, those of us who have been in these recent days in constant consultation with him know how warmly his purpose is set toward the goal of achievement to which all our faces are turned. He feels as we feel, as I have no doubt everybody in this room feels, that we are trusted to do a great thing, to do it in the highest spirit of friendship and accommodation, and to do it as promptly as possible, in order that the hearts of men may have fear lifted from them and that they may return to those pursuits of life which will bring them happiness and contentment and prosperity. Knowing his brotherhood of heart in these great matters, it affords me a personal pleasure to propose not only that the president of the council of ministers, but M. Clemenceau, shall be the permanent chairman of this conference.

To the French Senate

January 20, 1919

Mr. President of the Senate, Mr. President of the Republic:

You have made me feel your welcome in words as generous as they are delightful, and I feel that you have paid me to-day a very unusual and distinguished honor. You have graciously called me your friend. May not I in turn call this company a company of my friends? For everything that you have so finely said to-day, sir, has been corroborated in every circumstance of our visit to this country. Everywhere we have been welcomed not only, but welcomed in the same spirit and with the same thought, until it has seemed as if the spirits of the two countries came together in an unusual and beautiful accord.

We know the long breeding of peril through which France has gone. France thought us remote in comprehension and sympathy, and I dare say there were times when we did not comprehend as you comprehend the danger in the presence of which the world stood. There was no

time when we did not know of its existence, but there were times when we did not know how near it was. And I fully understand, sir, that throughout these trying years, when mankind has waited for the catastrophe, the anxiety of France must have been the deepest and most constant of all. For she did stand at the frontier of freedom. She had carved out her own fortunes through a long period of eager struggle. She had done great things in building up a great new France; and just across the border, separated from her only by a few fortifications and a little country whose neutrality it has turned out the enemy did not respect, lay the shadow cast by the cloud which enveloped Germany, the cloud of intrigue, the cloud of dark purpose, the cloud of sinister design. This shadow lay at the very borders of France. And yet it is fine to remember, sir, that for France this was not only a peril but a challenge. France did not tremble. France waited and got ready, and it is a fine thing that though France quietly and in her own way prepared her sons for the struggle that was coming, she never took the initiative or did a single thing that was aggressive. She had prepared herself for a defense, not in order to impose her will upon other peoples. She had prepared herself that no other people might impose its will upon her.

As I stand with you and as I mix with the delightful people of this country I see this in their thoughts: "America always was our friend. Now she understands. Now she comprehends; and now she has come to bring us this message, that understanding she will always be ready to help." And, while, as you say, sir, this danger may prove to be a continuing danger, while it is true that France will always be nearest this threat, if we can not turn it from a threat into a promise, there are many elements that ought to reassure France. There is a new world, not ahead of us, but around us. The whole world is awake, and it is awake to its community of interest. It knows that its dearest interests are involved in its standing together for a common

purpose. It knows that the peril of France, if it continues, will be the peril of the world. It knows that not only France must organize against this peril, but that the world must organize against it.

So I see in these welcomes not only hospitality, not only kindness, not only hope, but purpose, a definite, clearly defined purpose that men, understanding one another, must now support one another, and that all the sons of freedom are under a common oath to see that freedom never suffers this danger again. That to my mind is the impressive element of this welcome. I know how much of it, sir, and I know how little of it, to appropriate to myself. I know that I have the very distinguished honor to represent a nation whose heart is in this business, and I am proud to speak for the people whom I represent. But I know that you honor me in a representative capacity, and that my words have validity only in proportion as they are the words of the people of the United States. I delight in this welcome, therefore, as if I had brought the people of the United States with me and they could see in your faces what I see —the tokens of welcome and affection.

The sum of the whole matter is that France has earned and has won the brotherhood of the world. She has stood at the chief post of danger, and the thoughts of mankind and her brothers everywhere, her brothers in freedom, turn to her and center upon her. If this be true, as I believe it to be, France is fortunate to have suffered. She is fortunate to have proved her mettle as one of the champions of liberty, and she has tied to herself once and for all all those who love freedom and truly believe in the progress and rights of man.

At the Peace Conference, Opening Discussion on the League of Nations, January 25, 1919

Mr. Chairman:

I consider it a distinguished privilege to be permitted to open the discussion in this conference on the League of Nations. We have assembled for two purposes, to make the present settlements which have been rendered necessary by this war, and also to secure the peace of the world, not only by the present settlements but by the arrangements we shall make at this conference for its maintenance. The League of Nations seems to me to be necessary for both of these purposes. There are many complicated questions connected with the present settlements which perhaps can not be successfully worked out to an ultimate issue by the decisions we shall arrive at here. I can easily conceive that many of these settlements will need subsequent reconsideration, that many of the decisions we make shall need subsequent alteration in some degree; for, if I may judge by my own study of some of these questions, they are not susceptible of confident judgments at present.

It is, therefore, necessary that we should set up some machinery by which the work of this conference should be rendered complete. We have assembled here for the purpose of doing very much more than making the present settlements. We are assembled under very peculiar conditions of world opinion. I may say without straining the point that we are not representatives of Governments, but representatives of peoples. It will not suffice to satisfy governmental circles anywhere. It is necessary that we should satisfy the opinion of mankind. The burdens of this war have fallen in an unusual degree upon the whole population of the countries involved. I do not need to draw for you the picture of how the burden has been thrown back from the front upon the older men, upon the women, upon the children, upon the homes of the civilized world, and how

the real strain of the war has come where the eye of government could not reach, but where the heart of humanity beats. We are bidden by these people to make a peace which will make them secure. We are bidden by these people to see to it that this strain does not come upon them again, and I venture to say that it has been possible for them to bear this strain because they hoped that those who represented them could get together after this war and make such another sacrifice unnecessary.

It is a solemn obligation on our part, therefore, to make permanent arrangements that justice shall be rendered and peace maintained. This is the central object of our meeting. Settlements may be temporary, but the action of the nations in the interest of peace and justice must be permanent. We can set up permanent processes. We may not be able to set up permanent decisions. Therefore, it seems to me that we must take, so far as we can, a picture of the world into our minds. Is it not a startling circumstance, for one thing, that the great discoveries of science, that the quiet studies of men in laboratories, that the thoughtful developments which have taken place in quiet lecture rooms, have now been turned to the destruction of civilization? The powers of destruction have not so much multiplied as gained facility. The enemy whom we have just overcome had at his seats of learning some of the principal centers of scientific study and discovery, and he used them in order to make destruction sudden and complete; and only the watchful, continuous cooperation of men can see to it that science as well as armed men is kept within the harness of civilization.

In a sense the United States is less interested in this subject than the other nations here assembled. With her great territory and her extensive sea borders, it is less likely that the United States should suffer from the attack of enemies than that many of the other nations here should suffer; and the ardor of the United States—for it is a very deep and

genuine ardor—for the society of nations is not an ardor springing out of fear or apprehension, but an ardor springing out of the ideals which have come to consciousness in this war. In coming into this war the United States never for a moment thought that she was intervening in the politics of Europe or the politics of Asia or the politics of any part of the world. Her thought was that all the world had now become conscious that there was a single cause which turned upon the issues of this war. That was the cause of justice and of liberty for men of every kind and place. Therefore, the United States should feel that its part in this war had been played in vain if there ensued upon it merely a body of European settlements. It would feel that it could not take part in guaranteeing those European settlements unless that guaranty involved the continuous superintendence of the peace of the world by the associated nations of the world.

Therefore, it seems to me that we must concert our best judgment in order to make this League of Nations a vital thing—not merely a formal thing, not an occasional thing, not a thing sometimes called into life to meet an exigency, but always functioning in watchful attendance upon the interests of the nations—and that its continuity should be a vital continuity; that it should have functions that are continuing functions and that do not permit an intermission of its watchfulness and of its labour; that it should be the eye of the nations to keep watch upon the common interest, an eye that does not slumber, an eye that is everywhere watchful and attentive.

And if we do not make it vital, what shall we do? We shall disappoint the expectations of the peoples. This is what their thought centers upon. I have had the very delightful experience of visiting several nations since I came to this side of the water, and every time the voice of the body of the people reached me through any representative, at the front of its plea stood the hope for the League of

Nations. Gentlemen, the select classes of mankind are no longer the governors of mankind. The fortunes of mankind are now in the hands of the plain people of the whole world. Satisfy them, and you have justified their confidence not only but established peace. Fail to satisfy them, and no arrangement that you can make will either set up or steady the peace of the world.

You can imagine, gentlemen, I dare say, the sentiments and the purpose with which representatives of the United States support this great project for a league of nations. We regard it as the keystone of the whole program which expressed our purposes and ideals in this war and which the associated nations have accepted as the basis of the settlement. If we returned to the United States without having made every effort in our power to realize this program, we should return to meet the merited scorn of our fellow citizens. For they are a body that constitutes a great democracy. They expect their leaders to speak their thoughts and no private purpose of their own. They expect their representatives to be their servants. We have no choice but to obey their mandate. But it is with the greatest enthusiasm and pleasure that we accept that mandate; and because this is the keystone of the whole fabric, we have pledged our every purpose to it, as we have to every item of the fabric. We would not dare abate a single part of the program which constitutes our instruction. We would not dare compromise upon any matter as the champion of this thing—this peace of the world, this attitude of justice, this principle that we are the masters of no people but are here to see that every people in the world shall choose its own masters and govern its own destinies, not as we wish but as it wishes. We are here to see, in short, that the very foundations of this war are swept away. Those foundations were the private choice of small coteries of civil rulers and military staffs. Those foundations were the aggression of great powers upon the

small. Those foundations were the holding together of empires of unwilling subjects by the duress of arms. Those foundations were the power of small bodies of men to work their will upon mankind and use them as pawns in a game. And nothing less than the emancipation of the world from these things will accomplish peace. You can see that the representatives of the United States are, therefore, never put to the embarrassment of choosing a way of expediency, because they have laid down for them the unalterable lines of principle. And, thank God, those lines have been accepted as the lines of settlement by all the high-minded men who have had to do with the beginnings of this great business.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that when it is known, as I feel confident it will be known, that we have adopted the principle of the League of Nations and means to work out that principle in effective action, we shall by that single thing have lifted a great part of the load of anxiety from the hearts of men everywhere. We stand in a peculiar case. As I go about the streets here I see everywhere the American uniform. Those men came into the war after we had uttered our purposes. They came as crusaders, not merely to win a war, but to win a cause; and I am responsible to them, for it fell to me to formulate the purposes for which I asked them to fight, and I, like them, must be a crusader for these things, whatever it costs and whatever it may be necessary to do, in honor, to accomplish the object for which they fought. I have been glad to find from day to day that there is no question of our standing alone in this matter, for there are champions of this cause upon every hand. I am merely avowing this in order that you may understand why, perhaps, it fell to us, who are disengaged from the politics of this great Continent and of the Orient, to suggest that this was the keystone of the arch and why it occurred to the generous mind of our president to call upon me to open this debate. It is not because we alone

represent this idea, but because it is our privilege to associate ourselves with you in representing it.

I have only tried in what I have said to give you the fountains of the enthusiasm which is within us for this thing, for those fountains spring, it seems to me, from all the ancient wrongs and sympathies of mankind, and the very pulse of the world seems to beat to the surface in this enterprise.

At the Peace Conference, Presenting—as Chairman—the Report of the Commission on the League of Nations, February 14, 1919

Mr. Chairman:

I have the honor and as I esteem it the very great privilege of reporting in the name of the commission constituted by this conference on the formulation of a plan for the League of Nations. I am happy to say that it is a unanimous report, a unanimous report from the representatives of fourteen nations—the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, Belgium, Brazil, China, Czecho-Slovakia, Greece, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, and Serbia. I think it will be serviceable and interesting if I, with your permission, read the document as the only report we have to make.

COVENANT

Preamble—In order to promote international cooperation and to secure international peace and security by the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war, by the prescription of open, just and honorable relations between nations, by the firm establishment of the understandings of international law as the actual rule of conduct among governments, and by the maintenance of justice and a scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations in the dealings of organized peoples with one another, the Powers signatory to this Covenant adopt this constitution of the League of Nations.

Article I—The action of the High Contracting Parties under the terms of this Covenant shall be effected through the instrumentality of meetings of a Body of Delegates representing the

High Contracting Parties, of meetings at more frequent intervals of an Executive Council, and of a permanent international Secretariat to be established at the Seat of the League.

ARTICLE II—Meetings of the Body of Delegates shall be held at stated intervals and from time to time as occasion may require for the purpose of dealing with matters within the sphere of action of the League. Meetings of the Body of Delegates shall be held at the Seat of the League or at such other place as may be found convenient and shall consist of representatives of the High Contracting Parties. Each of the High Contracting Parties shall have one vote but may have not more than three representatives.

ARTICLE III—The Executive Council shall consist of representatives of the United States of America, the British Empire, France, Italy and Japan, together with representatives of four other States, members of the League. The selection of these four States shall be made by the Body of Delegates on such principles and in such manner as they think fit. Pending the appointment of these representatives of the other States, representatives of shall be members of the Executive Council.

Meetings of the Council shall be held from time to time as occasion may require and at least once a year at whatever place may be decided on, or failing any such decision, at the Seat of the League, and any matter within the sphere of action of the League or affecting the peace of the world may be dealt with at such meetings.

Invitations shall be sent to any Power to attend a meeting of the Council at which matters directly affecting its interests are to be discussed and no decision taken at any meeting will be binding on such Power unless so invited.

ARTICLE IV—All matters of procedure at meetings of the Body of Delegates or the Executive Council including the appointment of Committees to investigate particular matters shall be regulated by the Body of Delegates or the Executive Council and may be decided by a majority of the States represented at the meeting.

The first meeting of the Body of Delegates and of the Executive Council shall be summoned by the President of the United States of America.

ARTICLE V—The permanent Secretariat of the League shall be established at which shall constitute the Seat of the League. The Secretariat shall comprise such secretaries and staff as may be required, under the general direction and control of a Secretary-General of the League, who shall be chosen by the Executive Council; the Secretariat shall be appointed by the Secretary-General subject to confirmation by the Executive Council.

The Secretary-General shall act in that capacity at all meetings of the Body of Delegates or of the Executive Council.

The expenses of the Secretariat shall be borne by the States members of the League in accordance with the apportionment of the expenses of the International Bureau of the Universal Postal Union.

Article VI—Representatives of the High Contracting Parties and officials of the League when engaged on the business of the League shall enjoy diplomatic privileges and immunities, and the buildings occupied by the League or its officials or by representatives attending its meetings shall enjoy the benefits of extraterritoriality.

Article VII—Admission to the League of States not signatories to the Covenant and not named in the Protocol hereto as States to be invited to adhere to the Covenant requires the assent of not less than two-thirds of the States represented in the Body of Delegates, and shall be limited to fully self-governing countries including Dominions and Colonies.

No State shall be admitted to the League unless it is able to give effective guarantees of its sincere intention to observe its international obligations, and unless it shall conform to such principles as may be prescribed by the League in regard to its naval and military forces and armaments.

Article VIII—The High Contracting Parties recognize the principle that the maintenance of peace will require the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations, having special regard to the geographical situation and circumstances of each State; and the Executive Council shall formulate plans for effecting such reduction. The Executive Council shall also determine for the consideration and action of the several governments what military equipment and armament is fair and reasonable in proportion to the scale of forces laid down in the programme of disarmament; and these limits, when adopted, shall not be exceeded without the permission of the Executive Council.

The High Contracting Parties agree that the manufacture by private enterprise of munitions and implements of war lends itself to grave objections, and direct the Executive Council to advise how the evil effects attendant upon such manufacture can be prevented, due regard being had to the necessities of those countries which are not able to manufacture for themselves the munitions and implements of war necessary for their safety.

The High Contracting Parties undertake in no way to conceal from each other the condition of such of their industries as are capable of being adapted to war-like purposes or the sale of their armaments, and agree that there shall be full and frank interchange of information as to their military and naval programmes.

ARTICLE IX—A permanent Commission shall be constituted to advise the League on the execution of the provisions of Article VIII and on military and naval questions generally.

ARTICLE X—The High Contracting Parties undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all States members of the League. In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression the Executive Council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

ARTICLE XI—Any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the High Contracting Parties or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the League, and the High Contracting Parties reserve the right to take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations.

It is hereby also declared and agreed to be the friendly right of each of the High Contracting Parties to draw the attention of the Body of Delegates or of the Executive Council to any circumstances affecting international intercourse which threaten to disturb international peace or the good understanding between nations upon which peace depends.

ARTICLE XII—The High Contracting Parties agree that should disputes arise between them which cannot be adjusted by the ordinary processes of diplomacy, they will in no case resort to war without previously submitting the questions and matters involved either to arbitration or to inquiry by the Executive Council and until three months after the award by the arbitrators or a recommendation by the Executive Council; and that they will not even then resort to war as against a member of the League which complies with the award of the arbitrators or the recommendations of the Executive Council.

In any case under this Article, the award of the arbitrators shall be made within a reasonable time, and the recommendation of the Executive Council shall be made within six months after the submission of the dispute.

ARTICLE XIII—The High Contracting Parties agree that whenever any dispute or difficulty shall arise between them which they recognize to be suitable for submission to arbitration and which cannot be satisfactorily settled by diplomacy, they will submit the whole subject matter to arbitration. For this purpose the Court of arbitration to which the case is referred shall be the court agreed on by the parties or stipulated in any Convention existing between them. The High Contracting Parties agree that they will carry out in full good faith any award that may be rendered. In the event of any failure to carry out the award, the Executive Council shall propose what steps can best be taken to give effect thereto.

ARTICLE XIV—The Executive Council shall formulate plans for the establishment of a Permanent Court of International Justice and this Court shall, when established, be competent to hear and determine any matter which the parties recognize as suitable for submission to it for arbitration under the foregoing Article.

ARTICLE XV—If there should arise between States members of the League any dispute likely to lead to a rupture, which is not submitted to arbitration as above, the High Contracting Parties agree that they will refer the matter to the Executive Council; either party to the dispute may give notice of the existence of the dispute to the Secretary-General, who will make all necessary arrangements for a full investigation and consideration thereof. For this purpose the parties agree to communicate to the Secretary-General, as promptly as possible, statements of their case with all the relevant facts and papers, and the Executive Council may forthwith direct the publication thereof.

Where the efforts of the Council lead to the settlement of the dispute, a statement shall be published indicating the nature of the dispute and the terms of settlement together with such explanations as may be appropriate. If the dispute has not been settled, a report to the Council shall be published, setting forth with all necessary facts and explanations the recommendations which the Council think just and proper for the settlement of the dispute. If the report is unanimously agreed to by the members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute, the High Contracting Parties agree that they will not go to war with any party which complies with the recommendation and that, if any party shall refuse so to comply, the Council shall propose the measures necessary to give effect to the recommendation. If no such unanimous report can be made, it shall be the duty of the majority and the privilege of the minority to issue statements indicating what they believe to be the facts and containing the recommendations which they consider to be just and proper.

I pause to point out that a misconception might arise in connection with one of the sentences I have just read—"If any party shall refuse so to comply, the Council shall propose the measures necessary to give effect to the recommendation." A case in point, a purely hypothetical case, is this: Suppose that there is in the possession of a particular Power a piece of territory or some other substantial thing in dispute to which it is claimed that it is not entitled. Suppose that the matter is submitted to the Executive Council for a recommendation as to the settlement of the dispute,

diplomacy having failed; and suppose that the decision is in favor of the party which claims the subject matter of dispute as against the party which has the subject matter in dispute. Then, if the party in possession of the subject matter in dispute merely sits still and does nothing, it has accepted the decision of the Council, in the sense that it makes no resistance; but something must be done to see that it surrenders the subject matter in dispute. In such a case, the only case contemplated, it is provided that the Executive Council may then consider what steps may be necessary to oblige the party against whom judgment has gone to comply with the decisions of the Council.

The Executive Council may in any case under this Article refer the dispute to the Body of Delegates. The dispute shall be so referred at the request of either party to the dispute, provided that such request must be made within fourteen days after the submission of the dispute. In any case referred to the Body of Delegates all the provisions of this Article and of Article XII relating to the action and powers of the Executive Council shall apply to the action and powers of the Body of Delegates.

Article XVI—Should any of the High Contracting Parties break or disregard its covenants under Article XII, it shall thereby *ipso facto* be deemed to have committed an act of war against all the other members of the League, which hereby undertake immediately to subject it to the severance of all trade or financial relations. The prohibition of all intercourse between their nationals and the nationals of the covenant-breaking State, and the prevention of all financial, commercial, or personal intercourse between the nationals of the covenant-breaking State and the nationals of any other State, whether a member of the League or not.

It shall be the duty of the Executive Council in such case to recommend what effective military or naval force the members of the League shall severally contribute to the armed forces to be used to protect the covenants of the League.

The High Contracting Parties agree, further, that they will mutually support one another in the financial and economic measures which are taken under this Article, in order to minimize the loss and inconvenience resulting from the above measures, and that they will mutually support one another in resisting any special measures aimed at one of their number by the covenant-breaking State, and that they will afford passage through their territory to the forces of any of the High Contracting Parties who are cooperating to protect the covenants of the League.

Article XVII—In the event of disputes between one State member of the League and another State which is not a member of the League, or between States not members of the League, the High Contracting Parties agree that the State or States not members of the League shall be invited to accept the obligations of membership in the League for the purposes of such dispute, upon such conditions as the Executive Council may deem just, and upon acceptance of any such invitation, the above provisions shall be applied with such modifications as may be deemed necessary by the League.

Upon such invitation being given the Executive Council shall immediately institute an inquiry into the circumstances and merits of the dispute and recommend such action as may seem best and most effectual in the circumstances.

In the event of a Power so invited refusing to accept the obligations of membership in the League for the purposes of such dispute, and taking any action against a State member of the League which in the case of a State member of the League would constitute a breach of Article XII, the provisions of Article XVI shall be applicable as against the State taking such action.

If both parties to the dispute when so invited refuse to accept the obligations of membership in the League for the purposes of such dispute, the Executive Council may take such action and make such recommendations as will prevent hostilities and will result in the settlement of the dispute.

Article XVIII—The High Contracting Parties agree that the League shall be entrusted with the general supervision of the trade in arms and ammunition with the countries in which the control of this traffic is necessary in the common interest.

Let me say before reading Article XIX, that before being embodied in this document it was the subject matter of a very careful discussion by representatives of the five greater parties, and that their unanimous conclusion in the matter is embodied in this article.

Article XIX—To those colonies and territories which as a consequence of the late war have ceased to be under the sovereignty of the States which formerly governed them and which are inhabited by peoples not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world, there should be applied the principle that the well-being and development of such peoples form a sacred trust of civilization and that securities for the performance of this trust should be embodied in the constitution of the League.

The best method of giving practical effect to this principle is

that the tutelage of such peoples should be entrusted to advanced nations who by reason of their resources, their experience or their geographical position, can best undertake this responsibility, and that this tutelage should be exercised by them as mandataries on behalf of the League.

The character of the mandate must differ according to the stage of the development of the people, the geographical situation of the territory, its economic conditions and other similar circumstances.

Certain communities formerly belonging to the Turkish Empire have reached a stage of development where their existence as independent nations can be provisionally recognized subject to the rendering of administrative advice and assistance by a mandatory power until such time as they are able to stand alone. The wishes of these communities must be a principal consideration in the selection of the mandatory power.

Other peoples, especially those of Central Africa, are at such a stage that the mandatary must be responsible for the administration of the territory subject to conditions which will guarantee freedom of conscience or religion, subject only to the maintenance of public order and morals, the prohibition of abuses such as the slave trade, the arms traffic and the liquor traffic, and the prevention of the establishment of fortifications or military and naval bases and of military training of the natives for other than police purposes and the defense of territory, and will also secure equal opportunities for the trade and commerce of other members of the League.

There are territories, such as South-west Africa and certain of the South Pacific Islands, which, owing to the sparseness of their population, or their small size, or their remoteness from the centers of civilization, or their geographical contiguity to the mandatory state, and other circumstances, can be best administered under the laws of the mandatory state as integral portions thereof, subject to the safeguards above-mentioned in the interests of the indigenous population.

In every case of mandate, the mandatory state shall render to the League an annual report in reference to the territory committed to its charge.

The degree of authority, control, or administration to be exercised by the mandatory state shall if not previously agreed upon by the High Contracting Parties in each case be explicity defined by the Executive Council in a special Act or Charter.

The High Contracting Parties further agree to establish at the Seat of the League a Mandatory Commission to receive and examine the annual reports of the Mandatory Powers, and to assist the League in ensuring the observance of the terms of all Mandates.

Article XX—The High Contracting Parties will endeavor to secure and maintain fair and humane conditions of labor for men, women and children both in their own countries and in all coun-

tries to which their commercial and industrial relations extend; and to that end agree to establish as part of the organization of the League a permanent Bureau of Labor.

Article XXI—The High Contracting Parties agree that provision shall be made through the instrumentality of the League to secure and maintain freedom of transit and equitable treatment for the commerce of all States members of the League, having in mind, among other things, special arrangements with regard to the necessities of the regions devastated during the war of 1914-1918.

Article XXII—The High Contracting Parties agree to place under the control of the League all international bureaux already established by general treaties if the parties to such treaties consent. Furthermore, they agree that all such international bureaux to be constituted in future shall be placed under the control of the League.

Article XXIII—The High Contracting Parties agree that every treaty or international engagement entered into hereafter by any State member of the League, shall be forthwith registered with the Secretary-General and as soon as possible published by him, and that no such treaty or international engagement shall be binding until so registered.

Article XXIV—It shall be the right of the Body of Delegates from time to time to advise the reconsideration by States members of the League, of treaties which have become inapplicable, and of international conditions, of which the continuance may endanger the peace of the world.

Article XXV—The High Contracting Parties severally agree that the present Covenant is accepted as abrogating all obligations *inter se* which are inconsistent with the terms thereof, and solemnly engage that they will not hereafter enter into any engagements inconsistent with the terms thereof.

In case of the Powers signatory hereto or subsequently admitted to the League shall, before becoming a party to this Covenant, have undertaken any obligations which are inconsistent with the terms of this Covenant, it shall be the duty of such Power to take immediate steps to procure its release from such obligations.

Article XXVI—Amendments to this Covenant will take effect when ratified by the States whose representatives compose the Executive Council and by three-fourths of the States whose representatives compose the Body of Delegates.

It gives me pleasure to add to this formal reading of the result of our labours that the character of the discussion which occurred at the sittings of the commission was not

only of the most constructive but of the most encouraging sort. It was obvious throughout our discussions that, although there were subjects upon which there were individual differences of judgment, with regard to the method by which our objects should be obtained, there was practically at no point any serious difference of opinion or motive as to the objects which we were seeking. Indeed, while these debates were not made the opportunity for the expression of enthusiams and sentiments, I think the other members of the commission will agree with me that there was an undertone of high resolve and of enthusiasm for the thing we were trying to do, which was heartening throughout every meeting; because we felt that in a way this conference had entrusted to us the expression of one of its highest and most important purposes, to see to it that the concord of the world in the future with regard to the objects of justice should not be subject to doubt or uncertainty; that the cooperation of the great body of nations should be assured from the first in the maintenance of peace upon the terms of honor and of the strict regard for international obligation. The compulsion of that task was constantly upon us, and at no point was there shown the slightest desire to do anything but suggest the best means to accomplish that great object. There is very great significance, therefore, in the fact that the result was reached unanimously. Fourteen nations were represented, among them all of those powers which for convenience we have called the great powers, and among the rest a representation of the greatest variety of circumstance and interest. So that I think we are justified in saying that it was a representative group of the members of this great conference. The significance of the result, therefore, has that deepest of all meanings, the union of wills in a common purpose, a union of wills which can not be resisted, and which I dare say no nation will run the risk of attempting to resist.

Now, as to the character of the document. While it has consumed some time to read this document, I think you will see at once that it is, after all, very simple, and in nothing so simple as in the structure which it suggests for the League of Nations—a body of delegates, an executive council, and a permanent secretariat. When it came to the question of determining the character of the representation in the body of delegates, we were all aware of a feeling which is current throughout the world. Inasmuch as I am stating it in the presence of official representatives of the various Governments here present, including myself, I may say that there is a universal feeling that the world can not rest satisfied with merely official guidance. There reached us through many channels the feeling that if the deliberative body of the League was merely to be a body of officials representing the various Governments, the peoples of the world would not be sure that some of the mistakes which preoccupied officials had admittedly made might not be repeated. It was impossible to conceive a method or an assembly so large and various as to be really representative of the great body of the peoples of the world, because, as I roughly reckon it, we represent as we sit around this table more than twelve hundred million people. You can not have a representative assembly of twelve hundred million people, but if you leave it to each Government to have, if it pleases, one or two or three representatives, though only a single vote, it may vary its representation from time to time, not only but it may originate the choice of its several representatives, if it should have several, in different ways. Therefore, we thought that this was a proper and a very prudent concession to the practically universal opinion of plain men everywhere that they wanted the door left open to a variety of representation instead of being confined to a single official body with which they might or might not find themselves in sympathy.

And you will notice that this body has unlimited rights

of discussion—I mean of discussion of anything that falls within the field of international relationship—and that it is specially agreed that war or international misunderstandings or anything that may lead to friction and trouble is everybody's business, because it may affect the peace of the world. And in order to safeguard the popular power so far as we could of this representative body it is provided, you will notice, that when a subject is submitted, not to arbitration, but to discussion by the executive council, it can upon the initiative of either one of the parties to the dispute be drawn out of the executive council onto the larger forum of the general body of delegates, because throughout this instrument we are depending primarily and chiefly upon one great force, and that is the moral force of the public opinion of the world—the cleansing and clarifying and compelling influences of publicity—so that intrigues can no longer have their coverts, so that designs that are sinister can at any time be drawn into the open, so that those things that are destroyed by the light may be properly destroyed by the overwhelming light of the universal expression of the condemnation of the world.

Armed force is in the background in this program, but it *is* in the background, and if the moral force of the world will not suffice, the physical force of the world shall. But that is the last resort, because this is intended as a constitution of peace, not as a league of war.

The simplicity of the document seems to me to be one of its chief virtues, because, speaking for myself, I was unable to foresee the variety of circumstances with which this League would have to deal. I was unable, therefore, to plan all the machinery that might be necessary to meet differing and unexpected contingencies. Therefore, I should say of this document that it is not a straitjacket, but a vehicle of life. A living thing is born, and we must see to it that the clothes we put upon it do not hamper it—a vehicle of power, but a vehicle in which power may be varied at the discretion

of those who exercise it and in accordance with the changing circumstances of the time. And yet, while it is elastic, while it is general in its terms, it is definite in the one thing that we were called upon to make definite. It is a definite guarantee of peace. It is a definite guarantee by word against aggression. It is a definite guarantee against the things which have just come near bringing the whole structure of civilization into ruin. Its purposes do not for a moment lie vague. Its purposes are declared and its powers made unmistakable.

It is not in contemplation that this should be merely a league to secure the peace of the world. It is a league which can be used for cooperation in any international matter. That is the significance of the provision introduced concerning labour. There are many ameliorations of labour conditions which can be affected by conference and discussion. I anticipate that there will be a very great usefulness in the bureau of labour which it is contemplated shall be set up by the League. While men and women and children who work have been in the background through long ages, and sometimes seemed to be forgotten, while Governments have had their watchful and suspicious eyes upon the maneuvers of one another, while the thought of statesmen has been about structural action and the large transactions of commerce and of finance, now, if I may believe the picture which I see, there comes into the foreground the great body of the labouring people of the world, the men and women and children upon whom the great burden of sustaining the world must from day to day fall, whether we wish it to do so or not; people who go to bed tired and wake up without the stimulation of lively hope. These people will be drawn into the field of international consultation and help, and will be among the wards of the combined Governments of the world. There is, I take leave to say, a very great step in advance in the mere conception of that.

Then, as you will notice, there is an imperative article

concerning the publicity of all international agreements. Henceforth no member of the League can claim any agreement valid which it has not registered with the secretary general, in whose office, of course, it will be subject to the examination of anybody representing a member of the League. And the duty is laid upon the secretary general to publish every document of that sort at the earliest possible time. I suppose most persons who have not been conversant with the business of foreign offices do not realize how many hundreds of these agreements are made in a single year, and how difficult it might be to publish the more unimportant of them immediately—how uninteresting it would be to most of the world to publish them immediately—but even they must be published just so soon as it is possible for the secretary general to publish them.

Then there is a feature about this covenant which to my mind is one of the greatest and most satisfactory advances that have been made. We are done with annexations of helpless people, meant in some instances by some Powers to be used merely for exploitation. We recognize in the most solemn manner that the helpless and undeveloped peoples of the world, being in that condition, put an obligation upon us to look after their interests primarily before we use them for our interest; and that in all cases of this sort hereafter it shall be the duty of the League to see that the nations who are assigned as the tutors and advisers and directors of those peoples shall look to their interest and to their development before they look to the interests and material desires of the mandatory nation itself. There has been no greater advance than this, gentlemen. If you look back upon the history of the world you will see how helpless peoples have too often been a prey to powers that had no conscience in the matter. It has been one of the many distressing revelations of recent years that the great power which has just been happily defeated put intolerable burdens and injustices upon the helpless people of some of the

colonies which it annexed to itself; that its interest was rather their extermination than their development; that the desire was to possess their land for European purposes, and not to enjoy their confidence in order that mankind might be lifted in those places to the next higher level. Now, the world, expressing its conscience in law, says there is an end of that. Our consciences shall be applied to this thing. States will be picked out which have already shown that they can exercise a conscience in this matter, and under their tutelage the helpless peoples of the world will come into a new light and into a new hope.

So I think I can say of this document that it is at one and the same time a practical document and a humane document. There is a pulse of sympathy in it. There is a compulsion of conscience throughout it. It is practical, and yet it is intended to purify, to rectify, to elevate. And I want to say that, so far as my observation instructs me, this is in one sense a belated document. I believe that the conscience of the world has long been prepared to express itself in some such way. We are not just now discovering our sympathy for these people and our interest in them. We are simply expressing it, for it has long been felt, and in the administration of the affairs of more than one of the great states represented here—so far as I know, of all the great states that are represented here—that humane impulse has already expressed itself in their dealings with their colonies whose peoples were yet at a low stage of civilization. We have had many instances of colonies lifted into the sphere of complete self-government. This is not the discovery of a principle. It is the universal application of a principle. It is the agreement of the great nations which have tried to live by these standards in their separate administrations to unite in seeing that their common force and their common thought and intelligence are lent to this great and humane enterprise. I think it is an occasion, therefore, for the most profound satisfaction that this humane decision should have

been reached in a matter for which the world has long been waiting and until a very recent period thought that it was still too early to hope.

Many terrible things have come out of this war, gentlemen, but some very beautiful things have come out of it. Wrong has been defeated, but the rest of the world has been more conscious than it ever was before of the majesty of right. People that were suspicious of one another can now live as friends and comrades in a single family, and desire to do so. The miasma of distrust, of intrigue, is cleared away. Men are looking eye to eye and saying, "We are brothers and have a common purpose. We did not realize it before, but now we do realize it, and this is our covenant of fraternity and of friendship."

[On the next day—February 15, 1919—President Wilson set sail from France, bringing to an end his first sojourn in Europe at the peace conference. He came home especially to be in Washington during the closing days of the Sixty-fifth Congress. His vessel landed at Boston on February 24.]

Address of President Wilson at Boston, Mass., on His Return from Europe

February 24, 1919

Governor Coolidge, Mr. Mayor, Fellow Citizens:

I wonder if you are half as glad to see me as I am to see you. It warms my heart to see a great body of my fellow citizens again because in some respects during recent months I have been very lonely, indeed, without your comradeship and counsel, and I tried at every step of the work which fell to me to recall what I was sure would be your counsel with regard to the great matters which were under consideration.

I do not want you to think that I have not been appreciative of the extraordinarily generous reception which was

given me on the other side, in saying it makes me very happy to get home again. I do not mean to say I was not very deeply touched by the cries that came from greater crowds on the other side. But I want to say to you in all honesty, I felt them to be the call of greeting to you rather than to me. I did not feel that the greeting was personal. I had in my heart the overcrowning pride of being your representative and of receiving the plaudits of men everywhere who felt that your hearts beat with theirs in the cause of liberty. There was no mistaking the tone in the voices of these great crowds. It was not the tone of mere greeting, it was not the tone of mere generous welcome, it was the calling of comrade to comrade, the cry that comes from men who say we have waited for this day when the friends of liberty should come across the sea and shake hands with us to see that the new world was constructed upon a new basis and foundation of justice and right.

I can not tell you the inspiration that came from the sentiments that came out of these simple voices of the crowd. And the proudest thing I have to report to you is that this great country of ours is trusted throughout the world. I have not come to report the proceedings or results of the proceedings of the peace conference—that would be premature. I can say that I have received very happy impressions from this conference, impressions that while there are many differences of judgment, while there are some divergencies of object, there is nevertheless a common spirit and a common realization of the necessity of setting up a new standard of right in the world. Because the men who are in conference in Paris realize as keenly as any American can realize that they are not masters of their people, that they are servants of their people, and that the spirit of their people has awakened to a new purpose and a new conception of their power to realize that purpose, and that no man dare go home from that conference and report anything less noble than was expected of it.

The conference seems to you to go slowly; from day to day in Paris it seems to go slowly, but I wonder if you realize the complexity of the task which is undertaken. It seems as if the settlements of this war affect, and affect directly, every great, and I sometimes think every small, nation in the world. And no one decision can prudently be made which is not properly linked in with the great series of other decisions which must accompany it, and it must be reckoned in with the final result if the real quality and character of that result is to be properly judged.

What we are doing is to hear the whole case, hear it from the mouths of the men most interested, hear it from those who are officially commissioned to state it, hear the rival claims, hear the claims that affect new nationalities, that affect new areas of the world, that affect new commercial and economic connections that have been established by the great world war through which we have gone. And I have been struck by the moderateness of those who have represented national claims. I can testify that I have nowhere seen the gleam of passion. I have seen earnestness, I have seen tears come to the eyes of men who plead for downtrodden people whom they were privileged to speak for, but they were not tears of anger, they were tears of ardent hope; and I do not see how any man can fail to have been subdued by these pleas, subdued to this feeling that he was not there to assert an individual judgment of his own but to try to assist the cause of humanity.

And in the midst of it all every interest seeks out first of all when it reaches Paris the representatives of the United States. Why? Because—and I think I am stating the most wonderful fact in history—because there is no nation in Europe that suspects the motives of the United States. Was there ever so wonderful a thing seen before? Was there ever so moving a thing? Was there ever any fact that so bound the nation that had won that esteem forever to deserve it? I would not have you understand

that the great men who represent the other nations there in conference are disesteemed by those who know them. Quite the contrary. But you understand that the nations of Europe have again and again clashed with one another in competitive interest. It is impossible for men to forget these sharp issues that were drawn between them in times past. It is impossible for men to believe that all ambitions have all of a sudden been foregone. They remember territory that was coveted, they remember rights it was attempted to extort, remember political ambitions which it was attempted to realize, and while they believe men have come into different temper they can not forget these things, and so they do not resort to one another for dispassionate view of matters in controversy.

They resort to that nation which has won enviable distinction, being regarded as the friend of mankind. Whenever it is desired to send a small force of soldiers to occupy a piece of territory where it is thought nobody else will be welcome, they ask for American soldiers. And where other soldiers would be looked upon with suspicion and perhaps met with resistance, the American soldier is welcomed with acclaim. I have had so many grounds for pride on the other side of the water that I am very thankful that they are not grounds for personal pride, but for national pride.

If they were grounds for personal pride, I would be the most stuck-up man in the world. And it has been an infinite pleasure to me to see these gallant soldiers of ours, of whom the Constitution of the United States made me the proud commander. Everybody praises the American soldier with the feeling that in praising him he is subtracting from the credit of no one else. I have been searching for the fundamental fact that converted Europe to believe in us. Before this war Europe did not believe in us as she does now. She did not believe in us throughout the first three years of the war. She seems really to have believed that we were holding off because we thought we

could make more by staying out than by going in. And all of a sudden, in short eighteen months, the whole verdict is reversed. There can be but one explanation for it. They saw what we did, that without making a single claim we put all our men and all our means at the disposal of those who were fighting for their homes in the first instance, but for the cause—the cause of human right and justice—and that we went in, not to support their national claims, but to support the great cause which they held in common. And when they saw that America not only held the ideals but acted the ideals, they were converted to America and became firm partisans of those ideals.

I met a group of scholars when I was in Paris. Some gentlemen from one of the Greek universities who had come to see me and in whose presence, or rather in the presence of the traditions of learning, I felt very young, indeed. And I told them that I had had one of the delightful revenges that sometimes come to men. All my life I have heard men speak with a sort of condescension of ideals and of idealists, and particularly of those separated, encloistered persons whom they choose to term academic, who were in the habit of uttering ideals in a free atmosphere when they clash with nobody in particular. And I said I have had this sweet revenge. Speaking with perfect frankness in the name of the people of the United States I have uttered as the objects of this great war ideals, and nothing but ideals, and the war has been won by that inspiration.

Men were fighting with tense muscle and lowered head until they came to realize those things, feeling they were fighting for their lives and their country, and when these accents of what it was all about reached them from America they lifted their heads, they raised their eyes to heaven, then they saw men in khaki coming across sea in spirit of crusaders, and they found these were strange men, reckless of danger not only, but reckless because they seemed to see

something that made that danger worth while. Men have testified to me in Europe that our men were possessed by something that they could only call religious fervor. They were not like any of the other soldiers. They had vision; they had dream, and they were fighting in dream; and fighting in dream they turned the whole tide of battle, and it never came back. And now do you realize that this confidence we have established throughout the world imposes a burden upon us—if you choose to call it a burden. It is one of those burdens which any nation ought to be proud to carry. Any man who resists the present tides that run in the world will find himself thrown upon a shore so high and barren that it will seem as if he had been separated from his human kind forever.

Europe that I left the other day was full of something that it had never felt fill its heart so full before. It was full of hope. The Europe of the second year of the war—the Europe of the third year of the war—was sinking to a sort of stubborn desperation. They did not see any great thing to be achieved even when the war should be won. They hoped there would be some salvage; they hoped they could clear their territories of invading armies; they hoped they could set up their homes and start their industries afresh. But they thought it would simply be a resumption of the old life that Europe had led—led in fear; led in anxiety; led in constant suspicion and watchfulness. They never dreamed that it would be a Europe of settled peace and justified hope. And now these ideals have wrought this new magic that all the peoples of Europe are buoyed up and confident in the spirit of hope, because they believe that we are at the eve of a new age in the world, when nations will understand one another; when nations will support one another in every just cause; when nations will unite every moral and every physical strength to see that right shall prevail. If America were at this juncture to fail the world, what would come of it?

I do not mean any disrespect to any other great people when I say that America is the hope of the world. And if she does not justify that hope results are unthinkable. Men will be thrown back upon bitterness of disappointment not only but bitterness of despair. All nations will be set up as hostile camps again; men at the peace conference will go home with their heads upon their breasts, knowing they have failed—for they were bidden not to come home from there until they did something more than sign the treaty of peace. Suppose we sign the treaty of peace and that it is the most satisfactory treaty of peace that the confusing elements of the modern world will afford and go home and think about our labors we will know that we have left written upon the historic table at Versailles, upon which Vergennes and Benjamin Franklin wrote their names, nothing but a modern scrap of paper, no nations united to defend it, no great forces combined to make it good, no assurance given to the downtrodden and fearful people of the world that they shall be safe. Any man who thinks that America will take part in giving the world any such rebuff and disappointment as that does not know America. I invite him to test the sentiments of the nation.

We set this nation up to make men free and we did not confine our conception and purpose to America, and now we will make men free. If we did not do that all the fame of America would be gone and all her power would be dissipated. She would then have to keep her power for those narrow, selfish, provincial purposes which seem so dear to some minds that have no sweep beyond the nearest horizon. I should welcome no sweeter challenge than that. I have fighting blood in me and it is sometimes a delight to let it have scope, but if it is challenged on this occasion it will be an indulgence. Think of the picture, think of the utter blackness that would fall on the world. America has failed. America made a little essay at generosity and then withdrew. America said, "We are your

friends," but it was only for to-day, not for to-morrow. America said, "Here is our power to vindicate right," and then next day said, "Let right take care of itself and we will take care of ourselves." America said, "We set up light to lead men along the paths of liberty, but we have lowered it—it is intended only to light our own path."

We set up a great ideal of liberty, and then we said, "Liberty is a thing that you must win for yourself." Do not call upon us and think of the world that we would leave. Do you realize how many new nations are going to be set up in the presence of old and powerful nations in Europe and left there, there, if left by us, without a disinterested friend? Do you believe in the Polish cause as I do? Are you going to set up Poland, immature, inexperienced, as yet unorganized, and leave her with a circle of armies around her? Do you believe in the aspirations of the Czecho-Slovaks and Jugo-Slavs as I do? Do you know how many Powers would be quick to pounce upon them if there were not guarantees of the world behind their liberty? Have you thought of the sufferings of Armenia? You poured out your money to help succor Armenians after they suffered. Now set up your strength so that they shall never suffer again.

Arrangements of the present peace can not stand a generation unless they are guaranteed by the united forces of the civilized world. And if we do not guarantee them can you not see the picture? Your hearts have instructed you where the burden of this war fell. It did not fall upon national treasuries; it did not fall upon the instruments of administration; it did not fall upon the resources of nations. It fell upon the voiceless homes everywhere, where women were toiling in hope that their men would come back. When I think of the homes upon which dull despair would settle if this great hope is disappointed, I should wish for my part never to have had America play any part whatever in this attempt to emancipate the world.

But I talk as if there were any question. I have no more doubt of the verdict of America in this matter than I have doubt of the blood that is in me. And so, my fellow citizens, I have come back to report progress, and I do not believe that progress is going to stop short of the goal. The nations of the world have set their heads now to do a great thing, and they are not going to slacken their purpose. And when I speak of the nations of the world I do not speak of the governments of the world. I speak of peoples who constitute the nations of the world. They are in the saddle, and they are going to see to it that if their present governments do not do their will some other governments shall. The secret is out, and present governments know it. There is a great deal of harmony to be got out of common knowledge.

There is a great deal of sympathy to be got of living in the same atmosphere, and except for the differences of languages, which puzzled my American ear very sadly, I could have believed I was at home in France or Italy or in England when I was on the streets, when I was in the presence of crowds, when I was in great halls where men were gathered irrespective of class. I did not feel quite as much at home there as I do here, but I felt that now, at any rate after this storm of war had cleared the air men were seeing, eye to eye, everywhere and that these were the kind of folks who would understand what the kind of folks at home would understand; that they were thinking the same things.

It is a great comfort, for one thing, to realize that you all understand the language I am speaking. A friend of mine said that to talk through an interpreter was like witnessing the compound fracture of an idea. But the beauty of it is that whatever the impediments of the channel of communication the idea is the same, that it gets registered, and it gets registered in responsive hearts and receptive purposes. I have come back for a strenuous attempt to

transact business for a little while in America, but I have really come back to say to you, in all soberness and honesty, that I have been trying my best to speak your thoughts. When I sample myself I think I find that I am a typical American, and if I sample deep enough and get down to what probably is the true stuff of the men, then I have hope that it is part of the stuff that is like the other fellow's at home. And, therefore, probing deep in my heart and trying to see things that are right without regard to the things that may be debated as expedient, I feel that I am interpreting the purpose and the thought of America; and in loving America I find I have joined the great majority of my fellow men throughout the world.

Address of President Wilson at New York City
March 4, 1919

My Fellow Citizens:

I accept the intimation of the air just played ("Over There"). I will not come back " 'till it's over, over there." And yet I pray God in the interests of peace of the world that that may be soon.

The first thing that I am going to tell the people on the other side of the water is that an overwhelming majority of the American people is in favor of the League of Nations. I know that that is true. I have had unmistakable intimations of it from all parts of the country, and the voice rings true in every case. I account myself fortunate to speak here under the unusual circumstances of this evening. I am happy to associate myself with Mr. Taft in this great cause. He has displayed an elevation of view and devotion to public duty which is beyond praise.

And I am the more happy because this means that this

is not a party issue. No party has a right to appropriate this issue and no party will in the long run dare oppose it.

We have listened to so clear and admirable an exposition (Mr. Taft's address preceding the President) of many of the main features of the proposed covenant of the League of Nations that it is perhaps not necessary for me to discuss in any particular way the contents of the document. I will seek rather to give you its setting. I do not know when I have been more impressed than by the conferences of the commission set up by the conference of peace to draw up the covenant for a League of Nations. The representatives of fourteen nations sat around that board—not young men, not men inexperienced in the affairs of their own countries, not men inexperienced in the politics of the world—and the inspiring influence of every meeting was the concurrence of purpose on the part of all those men to come to an agreement and an effective working agreement with regard to this League of the civilized world.

There was a conviction in the whole impulse; there was conviction of more than one sort; there was the conviction that this thing ought to be done; and there was also the conviction that not a man there would venture to go home and say that he had not tried to do it.

Mr. Taft has set a picture for you of what failure of this great purpose would mean. We have been hearing for all these weary months that this agony of war has lasted of the sinister purpose of the Central Empires and we have made maps of the course that they meant their conquests to take. Where did the lines of that map lie, of that central line that we used to call from Bremen to Bagdad? They lay through these very regions to which Mr. Taft has called your attention, but they lay then through a united empire. The Austro-Hungarian Empire, whose integrity Germany was bound to respect as her ally, lay in the path of that line of conquest; the Turkish Empire, whose interests she professed to make her own, lay in the direct path that she

intended to tread. And now what has happened? The Austro-Hungarian Empire has gone to pieces and the Turkish Empire has disappeared, and the nations that effected that great result—for it was the result of liberation—are now responsible as the trustees of the assets of those great nations. You not only would have weak nations lying in this path but you would have nations in which that old poisonous seed of intrigue could be planted with the certainty that the crop would be abundant, and one of the things that the League of Nations is intended to watch is the course of intrigue. Intrigue can not stand publicity, and if the League of Nations were nothing but a great debating society it would kill intrigue.

It is one of the agreements of this covenant that it is the friendly right of every nation a member of the League to call attention to anything that it thinks will disturb the peace of the world, no matter where that thing is occurring. There is no subject that may touch the peace of the world which is exempt from inquiry and discussion, and I think everybody here present will agree with me that Germany would never have gone to war if she had permitted the world to discuss the aggression upon Serbia for a single week. The British foreign office pleaded that there might be a day or two delay so that representatives of the nations of Europe could get together and discuss the possibilities of a settlement. Germany did not dare permit a day's discussion. You know what happened. So soon as the world realized that an outlaw was at large the nations began, one by one, to draw together against her. We know for certainty that if Germany had thought for a moment that Great Britain would go in with France and Russia she never would have undertaken the enterprise, and the League of Nations is meant as notice to all outlaw nations that not only Great Britain but the United States and the rest of the world will go in to check enterprises of that sort. And so the League of Nations is nothing more nor less than the covenant that

the world will always maintain the standards which it has now vindicated by some of the most precious blood ever spilt.

The liberated peoples of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and of the Turkish Empire call out to us for this thing. It has not arisen in the councils of statesmen. Europe is a bit sick at heart at this very moment because it sees that the statesmen have had no vision and that the only vision has been the vision of the people. Those who suffer see. Those against whom wrong is wrought know how desirable is the right of the righteous. Nations that have long been under the heel of Austria, that have long cowered before the German, that have long suffered the indescribable agonies of being governed by the Turk, have called out to the world generation after generation for justice, liberation, and succor, and no cabinet in the world has heard them. Private organizations, pitying hearts, philanthropic men and women, have poured out their treasure in order to relieve these sufferings, but no nation has said to the nations responsible, "You must stop; this thing is intolerable and we will not permit it." And the vision has been with the people. My friends, I wish you would reflect upon this proposition; the vision as to what is necessary for great reforms has seldom come from the top in the nations of the world. It has come from the need and aspiration and self-assertion of great bodies of men who meant to be free. And I can explain some of the criticisms which have been leveled against this great enterprise only by the supposition that men who utter the criticisms have never felt the great pulse of the heart of the world.

And I am amazed—not alarmed but amazed—that there should be in some quarters such a comprehensive ignorance of the state of the world. These gentlemen do not know what the mind of men is just now. Everybody else does. I do not know where they have been closeted, I do not know by what influences they have been blinded, but I do know

they have been separated from the general currents of the thought of mankind.

And I want to utter this solemn warning, not in the way of a threat; the forces of the world do not threaten, they operate. The great tides of the world do not give notice that they are going to rise and run; they rise in their majesty and overwhelming might, and those who stand in the way are overwhelmed. Now the heart of the world is awake and the heart of the world must be satisfied. Do not let yourselves suppose for a moment that uneasiness in the populations of Europe is due entirely to economic causes or economic motives; something very much deeper underlies it all than that. They see that their governments have never been able to defend them against intrigue or aggression, and that there is no force of foresight or of prudence in any modern cabinet to stop war. And therefore they say "There must be some fundamental cause for this," and the fundamental cause they are beginning to perceive to be that nations have stood singly or in little jealous groups against each other, fostering prejudice, increasing the danger of war rather than concerting measures to prevent it; and that if there is right in the world, if there is justice in the world, there is no reason why nations should be divided in support of justice.

They are, therefore, saying if you really believe that there is a right, if you really believe that wars ought to be stopped, stop thinking about the rival interests of nations and think about men and women and children throughout the world. Nations are not made to afford distinction to their rulers by way of success in the maneuvers of politics; nations are meant, if they are meant for anything, to make the men, women, and children in them secure and happy and prosperous, and no nation has the right to set up its special interests against the interests and benefits of mankind, least of all this great nation which we love. It was set up for the benefit of mankind; it was set up to illustrate

the highest ideals and to achieve the highest aspirations of men who wanted to be free; and the world—the world of to-day—believes that and counts on us, and would be thrown back into the blackness of despair if we deserted it.

I have tried once and again, my fellow citizens, to say to little circles of friends or to larger bodies what seems to be the real hope of the peoples of Europe, and I tell you frankly I have not been able to do so, because when the thought tries to crowd itself into speech the profound emotion of the thing is too much; speech will not carry. I have felt the tragedy of the hope of those suffering peoples.

It is a tragedy because it is a hope which can not be realized in its perfection; and yet I have felt besides its tragedy its compulsion, its compulsion upon every living man to exercise every influence that he has to the utmost to see that as little as possible of that hope is disappointed, because if men can not now, after this agony of bloody sweat, come to their self-possession and see how to regulate the affairs of the world we will sink back into a period of struggle in which there will be no hope and therefore no mercy. There can be no mercy where there is no hope, for why should you spare another if you yourself expect to perish? Why should you be pitiful if you can get no pity? Why should you be just if, upon every hand, you are put upon?

There is another thing which I think the critics of this covenant have not observed. They not only have not observed the temper of the world but they have not even observed the temper of those splendid boys in khaki that they sent across the seas. I have had the proud consciousness of the reflected glory of those boys because the Constitution made me their commander in chief, and they have taught me some lessons. When we went into the war we went into it on the basis of declarations which it was my privilege to utter because I believed them to be an interpretation of the purpose and thought of the people of the United States.

And those boys went over there with the feeling that they were sacredly bound to the realization of those ideals; that they were not only going over there to beat Germany; they were not going over there merely with resentment in their hearts against a particular outlaw nation; but that they were crossing those 3,000 miles of sea in order to show to Europe that the United States, when it became necessary, would go anywhere where the rights of mankind were threatened. They would not sit still in the trenches. They would not be restrained by the prudence of experienced continental commanders. They thought they had come over there to do a particular thing, and they were going to do it and do it at once. And just as soon as that rush of spirit as well as the rush of body came in contact with the lines of the enemy they began to break, and they continued to break until the end. They continued to break, my fellow citizens, not merely because of the physical force of those lusty youngsters but because of the irresistible spiritual force of the armies of the United States. It was that that they felt. It was that that awed them. It was that that made them feel if these youngsters ever got a foothold they could never be dislodged, and that therefore every foot of ground that they won was permanently won for the liberty of mankind.

And do you suppose that, having felt that crusading spirit of these youngsters who went over there not to glorify America but to serve their fellow men, I am going to permit myself for one moment to slacken in my effort to be worthy of them and of their cause? What I said at the opening I said with a deeper meaning than perhaps you have caught; I do not mean to come back until it's over over there, and it must not be over until the nations of the world are assured of the permanency of peace.

Gentlemen on this side of the water would be very much profited by getting into communication with some gentlemen on the other side of the water. We sometimes think,

my fellow citizens, that the experienced statesmen of European nations are an unusually hardheaded set of men, by which we generally mean, although we do not admit it, they are a bit cynical; they say "This is a practical world," by which you always mean that it is not an ideal world; that they do not believe things can be settled upon an ideal basis. Well, I never came into intimate contact with them before, but if they used to be that way they are not that way now. They have been subdued, if that was once their temper, by the awful significance of recent events and the awful importance of what is to ensue, and there is not one of them with whom I have come into contact who does not feel he can not in conscience return to his people from Paris unless he has done his utmost to do something more than attach his name to a treaty of peace. Every man in that conference knows the treaty of peace in itself will be inoperative, as Mr. Taft has said, without this constant support and energy of a great organization such as is supplied by the League of Nations.

And men who, when I first went over there, were skeptical of the possibility of forming a League of Nations, admitted that if we could but form it it would be an invaluable instrumentality through which to secure the operation of the various parts of the treaty; and when that treaty comes back gentlemen on this side will find the covenant not only in it, but so many threads of the treaty tied to the covenant that you can not dissect the covenant from the treaty without destroying the whole vital structure. The structure of peace will not be vital without the League of Nations, and no man is going to bring back a cadaver with him.

I must say that I have been puzzled by some of the criticisms—not by the criticisms themselves—I can understand them perfectly even when there was no foundation for them—but by the fact of the criticism. I can not imagine how these gentlemen can live and not live in the atmosphere of the world. I can not imagine how they can live and not

be in contact with the events of their times, and I particularly can not imagine how they can be Americans and set up a doctrine of careful selfishness thought out to the last detail. I have heard no counsel of generosity in their criticism. I have heard no constructive suggestion. I have heard nothing except "Will it not be dangerous to us to help the world?" It would be fatal to us not to help it.

From being what I will venture to call the most famous and the most powerful nation in the world, we would of a sudden have become the most contemptible. So I did not need to be told, as I have been told, that the people of the United States would support this covenant. I am an American and I knew they would. What a sweet revenge it is upon the world. They laughed at us once; they thought we did not mean our professions of principle. They thought so until April of 1917. It was hardly credible to them that we would do more than send a few men over and go through the forms of helping, and when they saw multitudes hastening across the sea, and saw what those multitudes were eager to do when they got to the other side, they stood at amaze and said "The thing is real; this nation is the friend of mankind as it said it was." The enthusiasm, the hope, the trust, the confidence in the future bred by that change of view is indescribable. Take an individual American and you may often find him selfish and confined to his special interests; but take the American in the mass and he is willing to die for an ideal. The sweet revenge therefore is this, that we believed in righteousness and now we are ready to make the supreme sacrifice for it, the supreme sacrifice of throwing in our fortunes with the fortunes of men everywhere.

Mr. Taft was speaking of Washington's utterance about entangling alliances, and if he will permit me to say so, he put the exactly right interpretation upon what Washington said, the interpretation that is inevitable if you read what he said, as most of these gentlemen do not. And the thing

that he longed for was just what we are now about to supply; an arrangement which will disentangle all the alliances in the world.

Nothing entangles, nothing enmeshes a man except a selfish combination with somebody else. Nothing entangles a nation, hampers it, binds it, except to enter into a combination with some other nation against the other nations of the world. And this great disentanglement of all alliances is now to be accomplished by this covenant, because one of the covenants is that no nation shall enter into any relationship with another nation inconsistent with the covenants of the League nations. Nations promise not to have alliances. Nations promise not to make combinations against each other. Nations agree there shall be but one combination, and that is the combination of all against the wrongdoer.

And so I am going back to my task on the other side with renewed vigor. I had not forgotten what the spirit of the American people is. But I have been immensely refreshed by coming in contact with it again. I did not know how good home felt until I got here.

The only place a man can feel at home is where nothing has to be explained to him. Nothing has to be explained to me in America, least of all the sentiment of the American people. I mean, about great fundamental things like this. There are many differences of judgment as to policy—and perfectly legitimate. Sometimes profound differences of judgment, but those are not differences of sentiment, those are not differences of purpose, those are not differences of ideals. And the advantage of not having to have anything explained to you is that you recognize a wrong explanation when you hear it.

In a certain rather abandoned part of the frontier at one time it was said they found a man who told the truth; he was not found telling it, but he could tell it when he heard it. And I think I am in that situation with regard to some

of the criticisms I have heard. They do not make any impression on me because I know there is no medium that will transmit them, that the sentiment of the country is proof against such narrowness and such selfishness as that. I commend these gentlemen to communion with their fellow citizens.

What are we to say, then, as to the future? I think, my fellow citizens, that we can look forward to it with great confidence. I have heard cheering news since I came to this side of the water about the progress that is being made in Paris toward the discussion and clarification of a great many difficult matters; and I believe settlements will begin to be made rather rapidly from this time on at those conferences. But what I believe—what I know as well as believe—is this: that the men engaged in those conferences are gathering heart as they go, not losing it; that they are finding community of purpose, community of ideal to an extent that perhaps they did not expect; and that amidst all the interplay of influence—because it is infinitely complicated—amidst all the interplay of influence, there is a forward movement which is running toward the right. Men have at last perceived that the only permanent thing in the world is the right, and that a wrong settlement is bound to be a temporary settlement for the very best reason of all, that it ought to be a temporary settlement, and the spirits of men will rebel against it, and the spirits of men are now in the saddle.

When I was in Italy, a little limping group of wounded Italian soldiers sought an interview with me. I could not conjecture what it was they were going to say to me, and with the greatest simplicity, with touching simplicity, they presented me with a petition in favor of the League of Nations.

Their wounded limbs, their impaired vitality, were the only argument they brought with them. It was a simple request that I lend all the influence that I might happen

to have to relieve future generations of the sacrifices that they had been obliged to make. That appeal has remained in my mind as I have ridden along the streets in European capitals and heard cries of the crowd, cries for the League of Nations from lips of people who, I venture to say, had no particular notion of how it was to be done, who were not ready to propose a plan for a League of Nations, but whose hearts said that something by way of a combination of all men everywhere must come out of this. As we drove along country roads weak old women would come out and hold flowers to us. Why should they hold flowers up to strangers from across the Atlantic? Only because they believed that we were the messengers of friendship and of hope, and these flowers were their humble offerings of gratitude that friends from so great a distance should have brought them so great a hope.

It is inconceivable that we should disappoint them, and we shall not. The day will come when men in America will look back with swelling hearts and rising pride that they should have been privileged to make the sacrifice which it was necessary to make in order to combine their might and their moral power with the cause of justice for men of every kind everywhere.

God give us the strength and vision to do it wisely. God give us the privilege of knowing that we did it without counting the cost, and because we were true Americans, lovers of liberty and of right.

[On the following day, March 5, 1919, President Wilson sailed from New York to resume his participation in the peace conference at Paris. He arrived at Brest on March 13, and on the 14th he sat again in his place at the peace table. His first formal utterance was a public statement issued on April 23 explaining his reasons for insisting that the port of Fiume, formerly Austrian, should be assigned to the Jugoslavs as their only outlet to the sea, rather than to the Italians.]

Statement by President Wilson Dealing with the Italian-Jugoslav Dispute

Issued at Paris, April 23, 1919

In view of the capital importance of the questions affected, and in order to throw all possible light upon what is involved in their settlement I hope that the following statement will contribute to the final formation of opinion and to a satisfactory solution:

When Italy entered the war she entered upon the basis of a definite private understanding with Great Britain and France, now known as the Pact of London. Since that time the whole face of circumstances has been altered. Many other powers, great and small, have entered the struggle, with no knowledge of that private understanding.

The Austro-Hungarian Empire, then the enemy of Europe, and at whose expense the Pact of London was to be kept in the event of victory, has gone to pieces and no longer exists. Not only that, but the several parts of that empire, it is agreed now by Italy and all her associates, are to be erected into independent states and associated in a League of Nations, not with those who were recently our enemies, but with Italy herself and the powers that stood with Italy in the great war for liberty.

We are to establish their liberty as well as our own. They are to be among the smaller states whose interests are henceforth to be safeguarded as scrupulously as the interests of the most powerful states.

The war was ended, moreover, by proposing to Germany an armistice and peace which should be founded on certain clearly defined principles which set up a new order of right and justice. Upon those principles the peace with Germany has been conceived, not only, but formulated. Upon those principles it will be executed.

We cannot ask the great body of powers to propose and effect peace with Austria and establish a new basis of

independence and right in the states which originally constituted the Austro-Hungarian Empire and in the states of the Balkan group on principles of another kind. We must apply the same principles to the settlement of Europe in those quarters that we have applied in the peace with Germany. It was upon the explicit avowal of those principles that the initiative for peace was taken. It is upon them that the whole structure of peace must rest.

If those principles are to be adhered to, Fiume must serve as the outlet of the commerce, not of Italy, but of the land to the north and northeast of that port, Hungary, Bohemia, Rumania, and the states of the new Jugoslav group. To assign Fiume to Italy would be to create the feeling that we have deliberately put the port upon which all those countries chiefly depend for their access to the Mediterranean in the hands of a power of which it did not form an integral part and whose sovereignty, if set up there, must inevitably seem foreign, not domestic or identified with the commercial and industrial life of the regions which the port must serve. It is for that reason, no doubt, that Fiume was not included in the Pact of London, but there definitely assigned to the Croatians.

And the reason why the line of the Pact of London swept about many of the islands of the eastern coast of the Adriatic and around the portion of the Dalmatian coast which lies most open to that sea was not only that here and there on those islands, and here and there on that coast, there are bodies of people of Italian blood and connection, but also, and no doubt chiefly, because it was felt that it was necessary for Italy to have a foothold amidst the channels of the Eastern Adriatic in order that she might make her own coasts safe against the naval aggression of Austria-Hungary.

But Austria-Hungary no longer exists. It is proposed that the fortifications which the Austrian Government constructed there shall be razed and permanently destroyed.

It is part also of the new plan of European order which centres in the League of Nations that the new states erected there shall accept a limitation of armaments which puts aggression out of the question. There can be no fear of the unfair treatment of groups of Italian people there, because adequate guarantees will be given, under international sanction, of the equal and equitable treatment of all racial or national minorities.

In brief, every question associated with this settlement wears a new aspect—a new aspect given it by the very victory for right for which Italy has made the supreme sacrifice of blood and treasure. Italy, along with the four other great powers, has become one of the chief trustees of the new order which she has played so honorable a part in establishing.

And on the north and northeast her natural frontiers are completely restored, along the whole sweep of the Alps from northwest to southeast to the very end of the Istrian Peninsula, including all the great watershed within which Trieste and Pola lie, and all the fair regions whose face nature has turned toward the great peninsula upon which the historic life of the Latin people has been worked out through centuries of famous story ever since Rome was first set upon her seven hills.

Her ancient unity is restored. Her lines are extended to the great walls which are her natural defense. It is within her choice to be surrounded by friends; to exhibit to the newly liberated peoples across the Adriatic that noblest quality of greatness, magnanimity, friendly generosity, the preference of justice over interest.

The nations associated with her, the nations that know nothing of the Pact of London or of any other special understanding that lies at the beginning of this great struggle, and who have made their supreme sacrifice also in the interest, not of national advantage or defense, but of the settled peace of the world, are now united with her

older associates in urging her to assume a leadership which cannot be mistaken in the new order of Europe.

America is Italy's friend. Her people are drawn millions strong, from Italy's own fair countrysides. She is linked in blood, as well as in affection, with the Italian people. Such ties can never be broken. And America was privileged, by the generous commission of her associates in the war, to initiate the peace we are about to consummate—to initiate it upon terms which she had herself formulated and in which I was her spokesman.

The compulsion is upon her to square every decision she takes a part in with those principles. She can do nothing else. She trusts Italy, and in her trust believes that Italy will ask nothing of her that cannot be made unmistakably consistent with those sacred obligations.

The interests are not now in question, but the rights of peoples, of states new and old, of liberated peoples and peoples whose rulers have never accounted them worthy of a right; above all, the right of the world to peace and to such settlements of interest as shall make peace secure.

These, and these only, are the principles for which America has fought. These, and these only, are the principles upon which she can consent to make peace. Only upon these principles, she hopes and believes, will the people of Italy ask her to make peace.

[As a result of President Wilson's statement relating to Fiume, Italy's delegates abandoned the peace conference and returned home on April 25, remaining away until May 7, when the completed treaty of peace was handed to the Germans. Ultimately, in 1924, Fiume was annexed to Italy.]

Wilson Presents to the Peace Conference the Revised Covenant of the League of Nations

April 28, 1919

(As Chairman of the League of Nations Commission)

Mr. President:

When the text of the covenant of the League of Nations was last laid before you I had the honor of reading the covenant in extenso. I will not detain you to-day to read the covenant as it has now been altered, but will merely take the liberty of explaining to you some of the alterations that have been made.

The report of the commission has been circulated. You yourselves have in hand the text of the covenant, and will no doubt have noticed that most of the changes that have been made are mere changes of phraseology, not changes of substance, and that, besides that, most of the changes are intended to clarify the document, or, rather, to make explicit what we all have assumed was implicit in the document as it was originally presented to you. But I shall take the liberty of calling your attention to the new features such as they are. Some of them are considerable, the rest trivial.

The first paragraph of Article I is new. In view of the insertion of the covenant in the Peace Treaty, specific provision as to the signatories of the treaty, who would become members of the League, and also as to neutral states to be invited to accede to the covenant, were obviously necessary. The paragraph also provides for the method by which a neutral state may accede to the covenant.

The third paragraph of Article I is new, providing for the withdrawal of any member of the League on a notice given of two years.

The second paragraph of Article IV is new, providing for a possible increase in the Council, should other powers be added to the League of Nations whose present accession

is not anticipated. The two last paragraphs of Article IV are new, providing specifically for one vote for each member of the League in the Council which was understood before, and providing also for one representative of each member of the League.

The first paragraph of Article V is new, expressly incorporating the provision as to the unanimity of voting, which was at first taken for granted.

The second paragraph of Article VI has had added to it that a majority of the Assembly must approve the appointment of the Secretary General.

The first paragraph of Article VII names Geneva as the seat of the League and is followed by a second paragraph, which gives the Council power to establish the seat of the League elsewhere should it subsequently deem it necessary.

The third paragraph of Article VII is new, establishing equality of employment of men and women—that is to say, by the League.

The second paragraph of Article XIII is new, inasmuch as it undertakes to give instances of disputes which are generally suitable for submission to arbitration, instances of what have latterly been called "justiciable" questions.

The eighth paragraph of Article XV is new. This is the amendment regarding domestic jurisdiction, that where the Council finds that a question arising out of an international dispute affects matters which are clearly under the domestic jurisdiction of one or other of the parties, it report to that effect and make no recommendation.

The last paragraph of Article XV is new, providing for an expulsion from the League in certain extraordinary circumstances.

Article XXI is new. The second paragraph of Article XXII inserts the words with regard to mandatories "and who are willing to accept it," thus explicitly introducing the principle that a mandate cannot be forced upon a nation unwilling to accept it.

Article XXIII is a combination of several former articles, and also contains the following: A clause providing for the just treatment of aborigines, a clause looking toward a prevention of the white slave traffic and the traffic in opium, and a clause looking toward progress in international prevention and control of disease.

Article XXV specifically mentions the Red Cross as one of the international organizations which are to connect their work with the work of the League.

Article XXVI permits the amendment of the covenant by a majority of the states composing the Assembly, instead of three-fourths of the states, though it does not change the requirement in that matter with regard to the vote in the Council.

The second paragraph of Article XXVI is also new and was added at the request of the Brazilian delegation, in order to avoid certain constitutional difficulties. It permits any member of the League to dissent from an amendment, the effect of such dissent being withdrawal from the League.

And the annex is added giving the names of the signatories of the treaty, who become members, and the names of the states invited to accede to the covenant. These are all the changes, I believe, which are of moment.

Mr. President, I take the opportunity to move the following resolutions in order to carry out the provisions of the covenant. You will notice that the covenant provides that the first Secretary General shall be chosen by this conference. It also provides that the first choice of the four member states who are to be added to the five great powers on the Council is left to this conference.

I move, therefore, that the first Secretary General of the Council shall be the Honorable Sir James Eric Drummond, and, second, that until such time as the Assembly shall have selected the first four members of the League to be represented on the Council in accordance with Article

IV of the covenant, representatives of Belgium, Brazil, Greece and Spain shall be members; and, third, that the powers to be represented on the Council of the League of Nations are requested to name representatives who shall form a Committee of Nine to prepare plans for the organization of the League and for the establishment of the seat of the League and to make arrangements and to prepare the agenda for the first meeting of the Assembly, this committee to report both to the Council and to the Assembly of the League.

I think it not necessary to call your attention to other matters we have previously discussed—the capital significance of this covenant, the hopes which are entertained as to the effect it will have upon steadying the affairs of the world, and the obvious necessity that there should be a concert of the free nations of the world to maintain justice in international relations, the relations between people and between the nations of the world.

If Baron Makino will pardon me for introducing a matter which I absent-mindedly overlooked, it is necessary for me to propose the alteration of several words in the first line of Article V. Let me say that in several parts of the treaty, of which this covenant will form a part, certain duties are assigned to the Council of the League of Nations. In some instances it is provided that the action they shall take shall be by a majority vote. It is therefore necessary to make the covenant conform with the other portions of the treaty by adding these words. I will read the first line and add the words:

> Except where otherwise expressly provided in this covenant, or by the terms of this treaty, decisions at any meeting of the Assembly or of the Council shall require the agreement of all the members of the League represented at the meeting.

"Except where otherwise expressly provided in this covenant" is the present reading, and I move the addition

of "or by the terms of this treaty." With that addition, I move the adoption of the covenant.

An Address Before the International Law Society at Paris

May 9, 1919

Sir Thomas Barclay and Gentlemen:

I esteem it a very great pleasure to find myself in this distinguished company and in this companionship of letters. Sir Thomas has been peculiarly generous, as have the gentlemen at the other end of the table, in what they have said of me, but they have given me too high a rôle to play up to. It is particularly difficult to believe one's self to be what has been described in so intimate a company as this. When a great body of people is present, one can assume a pose which is impossible when there is so small a number of critical eyes looking directly at you.

And yet there was one part of Sir Thomas's generous interpretation which was true. What I have tried to do, and what I have said in speaking for America, was to speak the mind of America, to speak the impulse and the principles of America. And the only proof I have of my success is that the spirit of America responded—responded without stint or limit—and proved that it was ready to do that thing which I was privileged to call upon it to do.

And we have illustrated in this spirit of America something which perhaps may serve as a partial guide for the future. May I say that one of the things that has disturbed me in recent months is the unqualified hope that men have entertained everywhere of immediate emanicipation from the things that have hampered and oppressed them. You cannot in human experience rush into the light. You have to go through the twilight into the broadening

day before the noon comes and the full sun is on the landscape; and we must see to it that those who hope are not disappointed, by showing them the processes by which that hope must be realized—processes of law, processes of slow disentanglement from the many things that have bound us in the past.

You can not throw off the habits of society immediately any more than you can throw off the habits of the individual immediately. They must be slowly got rid of, or, rather, they must be slowly altered. They must be slowly adapted, they must be slowly shapen to the new ends for which we would use them. That is the process of law, if law is intelligently conceived.

I thought it a privilege to come here to-night, because your studies were devoted to one of the things which will be of most consequence to men in the future, the intelligent development of international law. In one sense, this great, unprecedented war was fought to give validity to international law, to prove that it has a reality which no nation could afford to disregard; that, while it did not have the ordinary sanctions, while there was no international authority as yet to enforce it it nevertheless had something behind it which was greater than that, the moral rectitude of mankind.

If we can now give to international law the kind of vitality which it can have only if it is a real expression of our moral judgment, we shall have completed in some sense the work which this war was intended to emphasize.

International law has perhaps sometimes been a little too much thought out in the closet. International law has —may I say it without offense?—been handled too exclusively by lawyers. Lawyers like definite lines. They like systematic arrangements. They are uneasy if they depart from what was done yesterday. They dread experiments. They like charted seas and, if they have no charts, hardly venture to undertake the voyage.

Now we must venture upon uncharted seas, to some extent, in the future. In the New League of Nations we are starting out on uncharted seas, and therefore we must have, I will not say the audacity, but the steadiness of purpose which is necessary in such novel circumstances. And we must not be afraid of new things, at the same time that we must not be intolerant of old things. We must weave out of the old materials the new garments which it is necessary that men should wear.

It is a great privilege if we can do that kind of thinking for mankind—human thinking, thinking that is made up of comprehension of the needs of mankind. And when I think of mankind, I must say I do not always think of well-dressed persons. Most persons are not well dressed. The heart of the world is under very plain jackets, the heart of the world is at very simple firesides, the heart of the world is in very humble circumstances; and, unless you know the pressure of life of the humbler classes, you know nothing of life whatever. Unless you know where the pinch comes you do not know what the pulse has to stand, you do not know what strain the muscles have to bear, you do not know what trial the nerves have to go through to hold on.

To hold on where there is no glee in life is the hard thing. Those of us who can sit sometimes at leisure and read pleasant books and think of the past, the long past, that we have no part in, and project the long future—we are not specimens of mankind. The specimens of mankind have not time to do that, and we must use our leisure when we have it to feel with them and think for them, so that we can translate their leisure into a fact, so far as that is possible, and see that that most complicated and elusive of all things which we call justice is accomplished. An easy word to say, and a noble word upon the tongue, but one of the most difficult enterprises of the human spirit!

It is hard to be just to those with whom you are intimate; how much harder it is to conceive the problems of those with whom you are not intimate, and be just to them. To live and let live, to work for people and with people, is at the bottom of the kind of experience which must underlie justice.

The sympathy that has the slightest touch of condescension in it has no touch of helpfulness about it. If you are aware of stooping to help a man, you cannot help him. You must realize that he stands on the same earth with yourself and has a heart like your own, and that you are helping him, standing on that common level and using that common impulse of humanity.

In a sense the old enterprise of national law is played out. I mean that the future of mankind depends more upon the relations of nations to one another, more upon the realization of the common brotherhood of mankind, than upon the separate and selfish development of national systems of law; so that the men who can, if I may express it so, think without language, think the common thoughts of humanity, are the men who will be most serviceable in the immediate future.

God grant that there may be many of them, that many men may see this hope and wish to advance it and that the plain men everywhere may know that there is no language of society in which he has no brothers or colaborers, in order to reach the great ends of equity and of high justice.

President Wilson's Message to the Sixty-sixth Congress Assembled in Special Session

May 20, 1919

[The President was in Paris, at the peace conference, and this message was received by cable. The new Congress, with Republicans now in control of both branches, had been called in special session to consider appropriation bills and tariff and tax readjustments.]

Gentlemen of the Congress:

I deeply regret my inability to be present at the opening of the extraordinary session of the Congress. It still seems to be my duty to take part in the counsels of the peace conference and contribute what I can to the solution of the innumerable questions to whose settlement it has had to address itself: for they are questions which affect the peace of the whole world and from them, therefore, the United States cannot stand apart. I deemed it my duty to call the Congress together at this time because it was not wise to postpone longer the provisions which must be made for the support of the government. Many of the appropriations which are absolutely necessary for the maintenance of the government and the fulfillment of its varied obligations for the fiscal year 1919-1920 have not yet been made; the end of the present fiscal year is at hand; and action upon these appropriations can no longer be prudently delayed. It is necessary, therefore, that I should immediately call your attention to this critical need. It is hardly necessary for me to urge that it may receive your prompt attention.

I shall take the liberty of addressing you on my return on the subjects which have most engrossed our attention and the attention of the world during these last anxious months, since the armistice of last November was signed, the international settlements which must form the subject matter of the present treaties of peace and of our national

action in the immediate future. It would be premature to discuss them or to express a judgment about them before they are brought to their complete formulation by the agreements which are now being sought at the table of the conference. I shall hope to lay them before you in their many aspects so soon as arrangements have been reached.

I hesitate to venture any opinion or press any recommendation with regard to domestic legislation while absent from the United States and out of daily touch with intimate sources of information and counsel. I am conscious that I need, after so long an absence from Washington, to seek the advice of those who have remained in constant contact with domestic problems and who have known them close at hand from day to day; and I trust that it will very soon be possible for me to do so. But there are several questions pressing for consideration to which I feel that I may, and indeed must, even now direct your attention, if only in general terms. In speaking of them I shall, I dare say, be doing little more than speak your own thoughts. I hope that I shall speak your own judgment also.

The question which stands at the front of all others in every country amidst the present great awakening is the question of labour; and perhaps I can speak of it with as great advantage while engrossed in the consideration of interests which affect all countries alike as I could at home and amidst the interests which naturally most affect my thought, because they are the interests of our own people.

By the question of labour I do not mean the question of efficient industrial production, the question of how labour is to be obtained and made effective in the great process of sustaining populations and winning success amidst commercial and industrial rivalries. I mean that much greater and more vital question, how are the men and women who do the daily labour of the world to obtain

progressive improvement in the conditions of their labour, to be made happier, and to be served better by the communities and the industries which their labour sustains and advances? How are they to be given their right advantage as citizens and human beings?

We cannot go any further in our present direction. We have already gone too far. We cannot live our right life as a nation or achieve our proper success as an industrial community if capital and labour are to continue to be antagonistic instead of being partners. If they are to continue to distrust one another and contrive how they can get the better of one another. Or, what perhaps amounts to the same thing, calculate by what form and degree of coercion they can manage to extort on the one hand work enough to make enterprise profitable, on the other justice and fair treatment enough to make life tolerable. That bad road has turned out a blind alley. It is no thoroughfare to real prosperity. We must find another, leading in another direction and to a very different destination. It must lead not merely to accommodation but also to a genuine cooperation and partnership based upon a real community of interest and participation in control.

There is now in fact a real community of interest between capital and labour, but it has never been made evident in action. It can be made operative and manifest only in a new organization of industry. The genius of our business men and the sound practical sense of our workers can certainly work such a partnership out when once they realize exactly what it is that they seek and sincerely adopt a common purpose with regard to it.

Labour legislation lies, of course, chiefly with the states; but the new spirit and method of organization which must be effected are not to be brought about by legislation so much as by the common counsel and voluntary cooperation of capitalist, manager, and workman. Legislation can go only a very little way in commanding what shall be done.

The organization of industry is a matter of corporate and individual initiative and of practical business arrangement. Those who really desire a new relationship between capital and labour can readily find a way to bring it about; and perhaps Federal legislation can help more than state legislation could.

The object of all reform in this essential matter must be the genuine democratization of industry, based upon a full recognition of the right of those who work, in whatever rank, to participate in some organic way in every decision which directly affects their welfare or the part they are to play in industry. Some positive legislation is practicable. The Congress has already shown the way to one reform which should be worldwide, by establishing the eight hour day as the standard day in every field of labour over which it can exercise control. It has sought to find the way to prevent child labour, and will, I hope and believe, presently find it. It has served the whole country by leading the way in developing the means of preserving and safeguarding life and health in dangerous industries. It can now help in the difficult task of giving a new form and spirit to industrial organization by coordinating the several agencies of conciliation and adjustment which have been brought into existence by the difficulties and mistaken policies of the present management of industry, and by setting up and developing new Federal agencies of advice and information which may serve as a clearing house for the best experiments and the best thought on this great matter, upon which every thinking man must be aware that the future development of society directly depends. Agencies of international counsel and suggestion are presently to be created in connection with the League of Nations in this very field; but it is national action and the enlightened policy of individuals, corporations, and societies within each nation that must bring about the actual reforms. The members of the committees on labour

in the two houses will hardly need suggestions from me as to what means they shall seek to make the Federal Government the agent of the whole nation in pointing out and, if need be, guiding the process of reorganization and reform.

I am sure that it is not necessary for me to remind you that there is one immediate and very practical question of labour that we should meet in the most liberal spirit. We must see to it that our returning soldiers are assisted in every practicable way to find the places for which they are fitted in the daily work of the country. This can be done by developing and maintaining upon an adequate scale the admirable organization created by the Department of Labour for placing men seeking work; and it can also be done, in at least one very great field, by creating new opportunities for individual enterprise. The Secretary of the Interior has pointed out the way by which returning soldiers may be helped to find and take up land in the hitherto undeveloped regions of the country which the Federal Government has already prepared or can readily prepare for cultivation and also on many of the cutover or neglected areas which lie within the limits of the older states; and I once more take the liberty of recommending very urgently that his plans shall receive the immediate and substantial support of the Congress.

Peculiar and very stimulating conditions await our commerce and industrial enterprise in the immediate future. Unusual opportunities will presently present themselves to our merchants and producers in foreign markets, and large fields for profitable investment will be opened to our free capital. But it is not only of that that I am thinking; it is not chiefly of that that I am thinking. Many great industries prostrated by the war wait to be rehabilitated, in many parts of the world where what will be lacking is not brains or willing hands or organizing capacity or experienced skill, but machinery and raw materials and capi-

tal. I believe that our business men, our merchants, our manufacturers, and our capitalists, will have the vision to see that prosperity in one part of the world ministers to prosperity everywhere: that there is in a very true sense a solidarity of interest throughout the world of enterprise, and that our dealings with the countries that have need of our products and our money will teach them to deem us more than ever friends whose necessities we seek in the right way to serve.

Our new merchant ships, which have in some quarters been feared as destructive rivals, may prove helpful rivals, rather, and common servants, very much needed and very welcome. Our great shipyards, new and old, will be so opened to the use of the world that they will prove immensely serviceable to every maritime people in restoring, much more rapidly than would otherwise have been possible, the tonnage wantonly destroyed in the war. I have only to suggest that there are many points at which we can facilitate American enterprise in foreign trade by opportune legislation and make it easy for American merchants to go where they will be welcomed as friends rather than as dreaded antagonists. America has a great and honorable service to perform in bringing the commercial and industrial undertakings of the world back to their old scope and swing again, and putting a solid structure of credit under them. All our legislation should be friendly to such plans and purposes.

And credit and enterprise alike will be quickened by timely and helpful legislation with regard to taxation. I hope that the Congress will find it possible to undertake an early reconsideration of Federal taxes, in order to make our system of taxation more simple and easy of administration and the taxes themselves as little burdensome as they can be made and yet suffice to support the Government and meet all its obligations. The figures to which those obligations have arisen are very great indeed, but

they are not so great as to make it difficult for the nation to meet them, and meet them, perhaps, in a single generation, by taxes which will neither crush nor discourage. These are not so great as they seem, not so great as the immense sums we have had to borrow, added to the immense sums we have had to raise by taxation, would seem to indicate; for a very large proportion of those sums were raised in order that they might be loaned to the governments with which we were associated in the war, and those loans will, of course, constitute assets, not liabilities, and will not have to be taken care of by our taxpayers.

The main thing we shall have to care for is that our taxation shall rest as lightly as possible on the productive resources of the country, that its rates shall be stable, and that it shall be constant in its revenue yielding power. We have found the main sources from which it must be drawn. I take it for granted that its mainstays will henceforth be the income tax, the excess profits tax, and the estate tax. All these can be so adjusted to yield constant and adequate returns and yet not constitute a too grievous burden on the taxpayer. A revision of the income tax has already been provided for by the act of 1918, but I think you will find that further changes can be made to advantage both in the rates of the tax and in the method of its collection. The excess profits tax need not long be maintained at the rates which were necessary while the enormous expenses of the war had to be borne; but it should be made the basis of a permanent system which will reach undue profits without discouraging the enterprise and activity of our business men. The tax on inheritances ought, no doubt, to be reconsidered in its relation to the fiscal systems of the several states, but it certainly ought to remain a permanent part of the fiscal system of the Federal Government also.

Many of the minor taxes provided for in the revenue legislation of 1917 and 1918, though no doubt made neces-

sary by the pressing necessities of the war time, can hardly find sufficient justification under the easier circumstances of peace, and can now happily be got rid of. Among these, I hope you will agree, are the excises upon various manufacturers and the taxes upon retail sales. They are unequal in the incidence on different industries and on different individuals. Their collection is difficult and expensive. Those which are levied upon articles sold at retail are largely evaded by the readjustment of retail prices. On the other hand, I should assume that it is expedient to maintain a considerable range of indirect taxes; and the fact that alcoholic liquors will presently no longer afford a source of revenue by taxation makes it the more necessary that the field should be carefully restudied in order that equivalent sources of revenue may be found which it will be ligitimate, and not burdensome, to draw upon. But you have at hand in the Treasury Department many experts who can advise you upon the matters much better than I can. I can only suggest the lines of a permanent and workable system, and the placing of the taxes where they will least hamper the life of the people.

There is fortunately, no occasion for undertaking in the immediate future any general revision of our system of import duties. No serious danger of foreign competition now threatens American industries. Our country has emerged from the war less disturbed and less weakened than any of the European countries which are our competitors in manufacture. Their industrial establishments have been subjected to greater strain than ours, their labour force to a more serious disorganization, and this is clearly not the time to seek an organized advantage. The work of mere reconstruction will, I am afraid, tax the capacity and the resources of their people for years to come. So far from there being any danger or need of accentuated foreign competition, it is likely that the conditions of the next few years will greatly facilitate the marketing of

American manufactures abroad. Least of all should we depart from the policy adopted in the Tariff Act of 1913, of permitting the free entry into the United States of the raw material needed to supplement and enrich our own abundant supplies.

Nevertheless, there are parts of our tariff system which need prompt attention. The experiences of the war have made it plain that in some cases too great reliance on foreign supply is dangerous, and that in determining certain parts of our tariff policy domestic considerations must be borne in mind which are political as well as economic. Among the industries to which special consideration should be given is that of the manufacture of dyestuffs and related chemicals. Our complete dependence upon German supplies before the war made the interruption of trade a cause of exceptional economic disturbance. The close relation between the manufacturer of dyestuffs, on the one hand, and of explosives and poisonous gases, on the other, moreover, has given the industry an exceptional significance and value. Although the United States will gladly and unhesitatingly join in the programme of international disarmament, it will, nevertheless, be a policy of obvious prudence to make certain of the successful maintenance of many strong and well equipped chemical plants. The German chemical industry, with which we will be brought into competition, was and may well be again, a thoroughly knit monopoly capable of exercising a competition of a peculiarly insidious and dangerous kind.

The United States should, moreover, have the means of properly protecting itself whenever our trade is discriminated against by foreign nations, in order that we may be assured of that equality of treatment which we hope to accord and to promote the world over. Our tariff laws as they now stand provide no weapon of retaliation in case other governments should enact legislation unequal in its bearing on our products as compared with the products

of other countries. Though we are as far as possible from desiring to enter upon any course of retaliation, we must frankly face the fact that hostile legislation by other nations is not beyond the range of possibility, and that it may have to be met by counter legislation. This subject, has, fortunately, been exhaustively investigated by the United States Tariff Commission. A recent report of that Commission has shown very clearly that we lack and that we ought to have the instruments necessary for the assurance of equal and equitable treatment. The attention of the Congress has been called to this matter on past occasions, and the past measures which are now recommended by the Tariff Commission are substantially the same that have been suggested by previous administrations. I recommend that this phase of the tariff question receive the early attention of the Congress.

Will you not permit me, turning from these matters, to speak once more and very earnestly of the proposed amendment to the Constitution which would extend the suffrage to women and which passed the House of Representatives at the last session of the Congress? It seems to me that every consideration of justice and of public advantage calls for the immediate adoption of that amendment and its submission forthwith to the legislatures of the several states. Throughout all the world this long delayed extension of the suffrage is looked for; in the United States, longer, I believe, than anywhere else, the necessity for it, and the immense advantage of it to the national life, has been urged and debated, by women and men who saw the need for it and urged the policy of it when it required steadfast courage to be so much beforehand with the common conviction; and I, for one, covet for our country the distinction of being among the first to act in a great reform.

The telegraph and telephone lines will of course be returned to their owners so soon as the retransfer can be effected without administrative confusion, so soon, that is,

as the change can be made with least possible inconvenience to the public and to the owners, themselves. The railroads will be handed over to their owners at the end of the calendar year; if I were in immediate contact with the administrative questions which must govern the retransfer of the telegraph and telephone lines, I could name the exact date for their return also. Until I am in direct contact with the practical questions involved I can only suggest that in the case of the telegraphs and telephones, as in the case of the railways, it is clearly desirable in the public interest that some legislation should be considered which may tend to make of these indispensable instrumentalities of our modern life a uniform and coordinated system which will afford those who use them as complete and certain means of communication with all parts of the country as has so long been afforded by the postal system of the Government, and at rates as uniform and intelligible. Expert advice is, of course, available in this way practical matter, and the public interest is manifest. Neither the telegraph nor the telephone service of the country can be said to be in any sense a national system. There are many confusions and inconsistencies of rates. The scientific means by which communication by such instrumentalities could be rendered more thorough and satisfactory has not been made full use of. An exhaustive study of the whole question of electrical communication and of the means by which the central authority of the nation can be used to unify and improve it, if undertaken by the appropriate committees of the Congress, would certainly result, indirectly even if not directly, in a great public benefit.

The demobilization of the military forces of the country has progressed to such a point that it seems to me entirely safe now to remove the ban upon the manufacture and sale of wines and beers, but I am advised that without further legislation, I have not the legal authority to remove the present restrictions. I therefore recommend that the Act

approved November 21, 1918, entitled, "An Act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the purposes of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide further for the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture and facilitating the distribution of agricultural products,' and for other purposes," be amended or repealed in so far as it applies to wines and beers.

I sincerely trust that I shall very soon be at my post in Washington again to report upon the matters which made my presence at the peace table apparently imperative, and to put myself at the service of the Congress in every matter of administration or counsel that may seem to demand executive action or advice.

WOODROW WILSON.

ADDRESS AT A DINNER IN PARIS TO PRESIDENT-ELECT EPITACIO PESSOA, OF BRAZIL

MAY 27, 1919

The honor has been accorded me of making the first speech to-night, and I am very glad to avail myself of that privilege. I want to say that I feel very much at home in this company, though, after all, I suppose no one of us feels thoroughly at home except on the other side of the water. We all feel in a very real sense that we have a common home, because we live in the atmosphere of the same conceptions and, I think, with the same political ambitions and principles.

I am particularly glad to have the opportunity of paying my respects to Mr. Pessoa. It is very delightful, for one thing, if I may say so, to know that my presidency is not ahead of me and that his presidency is ahead of him. I

wish him every happiness and every success with the greatest earnestness, and yet I can not, if I may judge by my own experience, expect for him a very great exhilaration in the performance of the duties of his office, because, after all, to be the head of an American State is a task of unrelieved responsibility. American constitutions as a rule put so many duties of the highest sort upon the President, and so much of the responsibility of affairs of state is centred upon him, that his years of office are apt to be years a little weighted with anxiety, a little burdened with the sense of the obligation of speaking for his people, speaking what they really think and endeavoring to accomplish what they really desire.

I suppose no more delicate task is given any man than to interpret the feelings and the purposes of a great people. I know that, if I may speak for myself, the chief anxiety I have had has been to be the true interpreter of a national spirit, expressing no private and peculiar views, but trying to express the general spirit of a nation. And a nation looks to its President to do that; and the comradeship of an evening like this does not consist merely of the sense of neighborhood. We are neighbors. We have always been friends. But that is all old. Something new has happened. I am not sure that I can put it into words, but there has been added to the common principles which have united the Americas time out of mind a feeling that the world at large has accepted those principles, that there has gone a thrill of hope and of expectation throughout the nations of the world which somehow seems to have its source and fountain in the things we always believed in. It is as if the pure waters of the fountains we had always drunk from had now been put to the lips of all peoples, and they had drunk and were refreshed.

And it is a delightful thought to believe that these are fountains which sprang up out of the soil of the Americas. I am not, of course, suggesting or believing that political

liberty had its birth in the American hemisphere, because of course it had not, but the peculiar expression of it characteristic of the modern time, that broad republicanism, that genuine feeling and practice of democracy, that is becoming characteristic of the modern world, did have its origin in America, and the response of the peoples of the world to this new expression is, we may perhaps pride ourselves, a response to an American suggestion.

If that is true, we owe the world a peculiar service. If we originated great practices, we must ourselves be worthy of them. I remember not long ago attending a very interesting meeting which was held in the interest of combining Christian missionary effort throughout the world. I mean eliminating the rivalry between churches and agreeing that Christian missionaries should not represent this, that, or the other church, but represent the general Christian impulse and principle of the world. I said I was thoroughly in sympathy with the principle, but that I hoped, if it was adopted, the inhabitants of the heathen countries would not come to look at us, because we were not ourselves united, but divided; that while we were asking them to unite, we ourselves did not set the example.

My moral from that recollection is this: We, among other friends of liberty, are asking the world to unite in the interest of brotherhood and mutual service and the genuine advancement of individual and corporate liberty throughout the world; therefore we must set the example.

I will recall here to some of you an effort that I myself made some years ago, soon after I assumed the Presidency of the United States, to do that very thing. I was urging the other states of America to unite with the United States in doing something which very closely resembled the formation of the present League of Nations. I was ambitious to have the Americas do the thing first and set the example to the world of what we are now about to realize. I had a double object in it, not only my pride that the

Americas should set the example and show the genuineness of their principles, but that the United States should have a new relation to the other Americas. The United States upon a famous occasion warned the governments of Europe that it would regard it as an unfriendly act if they tried to overturn free institutions in the Western Hemisphere and to substitute their own systems of government, which at that time were inimical to those free institutions; but, while the United States thus undertook of its own motion to be the champion of America against such aggressions from Europe, it did not give any conclusive assurance that it would never itself be the aggressor. What I wanted to do in the proposals to which I have just referred was to offer to the other American states our own bond that they were safe against us, and any illicit ambitions we might entertain, as well as safe, so far as the power of the United States could make them safe, against foreign nations.

Of course, I am sorry that happy consummation did not come, but, after all, no doubt the impulse was contributed to by us which has now led to a sort of mutual pledge on the part of all the self-governing nations of the world that they will be friends to each other, not only, but that they will take pains to secure each others' safety and independence and territorial integrity.

No greater thing has ever happened in the political world than that, and I am particularly gratified to-night to think of the hours I have had the pleasure of spending with Mr. Pessoa as a member, along with him, of the commission on the League of Nations, which prepared the covenant which was submitted to the conference. I have felt, as I looked down the table and caught his eye, that we had the same American mind in regard to the business, and when I made suggestions or used arguments that I felt were characteristically American, I would always catch sympathy in his eyes. When others perhaps did not catch the point at once, he always caught it, because, though

we were not bred to the same language literally, we were bred to the same political language and the same political thought, and our ideas were the same.

It is, therefore, with a real sense of communication and of fellowship and of something more than neighborly familiarity that I find myself in this congenial company and that I take my part with you in paying my tribute and extending my warmest, best wishes to the great country of Brazil and to the gentleman who will worthily represent her in her Presidential chair.

I ask you to join with me in drinking the health of the President-elect of Brazil.

Address Before the Belgian Parliament

Brussels, June 19, 1919

[King Albert and Queen Elizabeth were present, and addresses of welcome were made by the President of the Belgian Chamber of Deputies and by Foreign Minister Paul Hymans.]

Your Majesty and Gentlemen:

It is with such profound emotion that I express my deepest appreciation of the generous welcome you have given me that I am not at all sure that I can find the words to say what it is in my heart to say.

Mr. Hymans has repeated to you some of the things which America tried to do to show her profound friendship and sympathy with Belgium, but Mr. Hymans was not able to testify, as I am, to the heart of America that was back of her efforts. For America did not do these things merely because she conceived it her duty to do them, but because she rejoiced in this way to show her real humanity and her real knowledge of the needs of an old and faithful friend. And these things, I hope, will be the

dearer in your memory because of the spirit which was behind them.

They were small in themselves. We often had the feeling that we were not doing as much as we could do. We knew all the time we were not doing as much as we wanted to do. And it is this spirit, and not what was done, which deserves I hope, to be remembered.

It is very delightful to find myself at last in Belgium. I have come at the first moment that I was relieved from imperative duty. I could not come for my own pleasure, and in neglect of duty, to a country where I knew that I should meet men who had done their duty; where I knew I should meet a Sovereign who had constantly identified himself with the interests and the life of his people at every sacrifice to himself; where I should be greeted by a Burgomaster who never allowed the enemy to thrust aside and always asserted the majority and authority of the municipality which he represented; where I should have the privilege of meeting a Cardinal who was the true shepherd of his flock, the majesty of whose spiritual authority awed even the unscrupulous enemy himself, who knew that they did not dare lay hand upon this servant of God, and where I should have the privilege of grasping the hand of a General who never surrendered, and on every hand should meet men who had known their duty and had done it.

I could not come to Belgium until I felt that I was released from my duty. I sought in this way to honor you by recognizing the spirit which I knew I should meet with here. When I realized that at my back are the fighting standards of Belgium, it pleases me to think that I am in the presence of those who knew how to shed their blood, as well as do their duty, for their country. They need no encomiums from me.

I would rather turn for a moment with you to the significance of the place which Belgium bears in this contest,

which, thank God, is ended. I came here because I wished to associate myself in counsel with the men who I knew had felt so deeply the pulse of this terrible struggle, and I wanted to come also because I realized, I believe, that Belgium and her part in the war is in one sense the key of the whole struggle, because the violation of Belgium was the call to duty which aroused the nations.

The enemy committed many outrages in this war, gentlemen, but the initial outrage was the fundamental outrage of all. They, with that insolent indifference, violated the sacredness of treaties. They showed that they did not care for the honor of any pledge. They showed that they did not care for the independence of any nation, whether it had raised its hand against them or not; that they were ruthless in their determination to have their whim at their pleasure. Therefore it was the volation of Belgium that awakened the world to the realization of the character of the struggle.

A very interesting thing came out of that struggle, which seems almost like an illogical consequence. One of the first things that the representatives of Belgium said to me after the war began was that they did not want their neutrality guaranteed. They did not want any neutrality. They wanted equality, not because, as I understood them, their neutrality was insecure, but because their neutrality put them upon a different basis of action from other peoples. In their natural and proper pride they desired to occupy a place that was not exceptional, but in the ranks of free peoples under all Governments.

I honored this instinct in them, and it was for that reason that the first time I had occasion to speak of what the war might accomplish for Belgium, I spoke of her winning a place of equality among the nations. So Belgium has, so to say, once more come into her own through this deep valley of suffering through which she has gone.

Not only that, but her cause has linked the Governments

of the civilized world together. They have realized their common duty. They have drawn together as if instinctively into a league of right. They have put the whole power of organized manhood behind this conception of justice, which is common to mankind.

That is the significance, gentlemen, of the League of Nations. The League of Nations was an inevitable consequence of this war. It was a league of rights, and no thoughtful statesman who let his thought run into the future could wish for a moment to slacken those bonds. His first thought would be to strengthen them and to perpetuate this combination of the great Governments of the world for the maintenance of justice.

The League of Nations is the child of this great war, for it is the expression of those permanent resolutions which grew out of the temporary necessities of this great struggle, and any nation which declines to adhere to this covenant deliberately turns away from the most telling appeal that has ever been made to its conscience and to its manhood.

The nation that wishes to use the League of Nations for its convenience and not for the service of the rest of the world deliberately chooses to turn back to those bad days of selfish contest, when every nation thought first and always of itself and not of its neighbors, thought of its rights, and forgot its duties; thought of its power, and overlooked its responsibility.

Those bad days, I hope, are gone, and the great moral power backed, if need be, by the great physical power of the civilized nations of the world, will now stand firm for the maintenance of the fine partisanship which we have thus inaugurated.

It can not be otherwise. Perhaps the conscience of some chancelleries was asleep, and the outrage of Germany awakened it. You can not see one great nation violate every principle of right without beginning to know what

the principles of right are and to love them, to despise those who violate them and to form the firm resolve that such a violation shall now be punished, and in the future be prevented.

These are the feelings with which I have come to Belgium, and it has been my thought to propose to the Congress of the United States, as a recognition and as a welcome of Belgium into her new status of complete independence, to raise the mission of the United States of America to Belgium to the rank of an embassy and send an Ambassador. This is the rank which Belgium enjoys in our esteem, why should she not enjoy it in form and in fact?

So, gentlemen, we turn to the future. Mr. Hymans has spoken in true terms of the necessities that lie ahead of Belgium and of many another nation that has come through this great war with suffering and with loss. We have shown Belgium, in the forms which he has been generous enough to recite, our friendship in the past. It is now our duty to organize our friendship along new lines.

The Belgium people and the Belgium leaders need only the tools to restore their life. Their thoughts are not crushed. Their purposes are not obscured. Their plans are complete and their knowledge of what is involved in industrial revival is complete.

What their friends must do is to see to it that Belgium gets the necessary priority with regard to obtaining raw materials, the necessary priority in obtaining the means to restore the machinery by which she can use these raw materials, and the credit by which she can bridge over the years which it will be necessary for her to wait to begin again.

These are not so much tasks for Governments as they are tasks for thoughtful business men and financiers and those who are producers in other countries. It is a question of the world also. But the shipping of the world will

be relieved of its burdens of troops in a comparatively near future, and there will be new bottoms in which to carry the cargoes, and the cargoes ought readily to impel the master of the ship to steer for Belgian ports.

I believe, after having consulted many times with my very competent advisers in the matter, that an organized method of accomplishing these things can be found. It is a matter of almost daily discussion in Paris, and I believe that as we discuss from day to day we come nearer and nearer to a workable solution and a probable plan. I hope not only, but I believe, that such a plan will be found, and you may be sure that America will be pleased, I will not say more than any other friend of Belgium, but as much as any other friend of Belgium, if these plans are perfected and carried out.

Friendship, gentlemen, is a very practical matter. One thing that I think I have grown weary of is sentiment that does not express itself in action. How real the world has been made by this war! How actual all its facts seem! How terrible the circumstances of its life! And if we be friends we must think of each other not only, but we must act for each other; we must not only have a sentimental regard, but we must put that regard into actual deeds.

There is an old proverb which has no literary beauty, but has a great deal of significance: "The proof of the pudding is the eating thereof." It is by that maxim that all friendships are to be judged. It is when a friendship is put to the proof that its quality is found. So, our business now is not to talk, but to act. It is not so much to debate, as to resolve. It is not so much to hesitate upon the plan, as to perfect the details of the plan and at every turn to be sure that we think not only of ourselves, but of humanity. For gentlemen, the realities of this world are not discussed around dinner tables.

Do you realize for how small a percentage of mankind

it is possible to get anything for to-morrow if you do not work to-day; how small a percentage of mankind can slacken their physical and thoughtful effort for a moment, and not find the means of subsistence fail them?

Some men can take holidays, some men can relieve themselves from the burden of work. But most men can not, most women can not, and the children wait upon the men and women who work, work every day, work from the dawn until the evening. These are the people we must think about. They constitute the rank and file of mankind. They are the constituents of statesmen, and statesmen must see to it that policies are not now run along the lines of national pride, but along the lines of humanity, along the lines of service, along those lines which we have been taught are the real lines by the deep suffering of this war.

This is the healing peace of which Mr. Hymans eloquently spoke. You heal the nations by serving the nations, and you serve them by thinking of mankind.

President Wilson Extols the Treaty of Peace

June 28, 1919

(By cable from Paris; made public at Washington)

My Fellow Countrymen:

The treaty of peace has been signed. If it is ratified and acted upon in full and sincere execution of its terms it will furnish the charter for a new order of affairs in the world. It is a severe treaty in the duties and penalties it imposes upon Germany; but it is severe only because great wrongs done by Germany are to be righted and repaired; it imposes nothing that Germany cannot do; and she can regain her rightful standing in the world by the prompt and honorable fulfillment of its terms.

And it is much more than a treaty of peace with Ger-

many. It liberates great peoples who have never before been able to find the way to liberty. It tends, once for all, an old and intolerable order under which small groups of selfish men could use the peoples of great empires to serve their ambition for power and dominion. It associates the free Governments of the world in a permanent League in which they are pledged to use their united power to maintain peace by maintaining right and justice.

It makes international law a reality supported by imperative sanctions. It does away with the right of conquest and rejects the policy of annexation and substitutes a new order under which backward nations—populations which have not yet come to political consciousness and peoples who are ready for independence but not yet quite prepared to dispense with protection and guidance—shall no more be subjected to the domination and exploitation of a stronger nation, but shall be put under the friendly direction and afforded the helpful assistance of governments which undertake to be responsible to the opinion of mankind in the execution of their task by accepting the direction of the League of Nations.

It recognizes the inalienable rights of nationality, the rights of minorities and the sanctity of religious belief and practice. It lays the basis for conventions which shall free the commercial intercourse of the world from unjust and vexatious restrictions and for every sort of international cooperation that will serve to cleanse the life of the world and facilitate its common action in beneficent service of every kind. It furnishes guarantees such as were never given or even contemplated for the fair treatment of all who labour at the daily tasks of the world.

It is for this reason that I have spoken of it as a great charter for a new order of affairs. There is ground here for deep satisfaction, universal reassurance, and confident hope.

WOODROW WILSON.

[On May 7 a treaty of peace, framed at Versailles by representatives of twenty-seven Allied and associated powers, had been handed to the German peace commission. The Germans had submitted certain observations on May 29, and on June 14 the so-called Council of Five had finished a revision of the treaty somewhat more lenient toward Germany. On June 22 the German National Assembly at Weimar authorized its acceptance, and on June 28, 1919, the treaty of peace was signed at Versailles. President Wilson sailed for home on the following day.]

Wilson's Address at New York, on His Return from the Second and Last Trip to Europe

July 8, 1919

Fellow Countrymen:

I am not going to try this afternoon to make you a real speech. I am a bit alarmed to find how many speeches I have in my system undelivered, but they are all speeches that come from the mind, and I want to say to you this afternoon only a few words from the heart.

You have made me deeply happy by the generous welcome you have extended to me. But I do not believe that the welcome you extend to me is half as great as that which I extend to you. Why, Jerseyman though I am, this is the first time I ever thought Hoboken beautiful. I really have, though I have tried on the other side of the water to conceal it, been the most homesick man in the American Expeditionary Force, and it is with feelings that it would be vain for me to try to express that I find myself in this beloved country again.

I do not say that because I lack in admiration of other countries. There have been many things that softened my homesickness. One of the chief things that softened it was the very generous welcome that they extended to me as your representative on the other side of the water, and it was still more softened by the pride that I had in dis-

covering that America had at last convinced the world of her true character. I was welcome because they had seen with their own eyes what America had done for the world. They had deemed her selfish; they had deemed her devoted to material interests, and they had seen her boys come across the water with a vision even more beautiful than that which they conceived when they had entertained dreams of liberty and of peace. And when I had the added pride of finding out by personal observation the kind of men we had sent over—I had crossed the seas with the kind of men who had taken them over; without whom they could not have got to Europe—and then when I got there I saw that army of men, that army of clean men, that army of men devoted to the highest interests of humanity, that army that one was glad to point out and say, "These are my fellow-countrymen"—it softens the homesickness a good deal to have so much of home along with you.

And these boys were constantly reminding me of home. They did not walk the streets like anybody else. I do not mean that they walked the streets self-assertively; they did not. They walked the streets as if they knew that they belonged wherever free men lived, that they were welcome in the great Republic of France and were comrades with the other armies that had helped to win the great battle and to show the great sacrifice. It is a wonderful thing for this nation, hitherto isolated from the large affairs of the world, to win not only the universal confidence of the people of the world, but their universal affection. And that, and nothing less than that, is what has happened. Wherever it was suggested that troops should be sent and it was desired that troops of occupation should excite no prejudice, no uneasiness on the part of those to whom they were sent, the men who represented the other nations came to me and asked me to send American soldiers. They not only implied but they said that the presence of American soldiers would be known not to mean anything except

friendly protection and assistance. Do you wonder that it made our hearts swell with pride to realize these things?

But while these things in some degree softened my homesickness they made me all the more eager to get home where the rest of the folks live; to get home where the great dynamo of national energy was situated; to get home where the great purposes of national action were formed, and to be allowed to take part in the counsels and in the actions which were formed and to be taken by this great nation, which from first to last has followed the vision of the men who set it up and created it.

We have had our eyes very close upon our tasks at times, but whenever we lifted them we were accustomed to lift them to a distant horizon. We were aware that all the peoples of the earth had turned their faces toward us as those who were the friends of freedom and of right, and whenever we thought of national policy and of its reaction upon the affairs of the world we knew we were under bonds to do the large thing and the right thing. It is a privilege, therefore, beyond all computation for a man, whether in a great capacity or a small, to take part in the counsels and in the resolutions of a people like this.

I am afraid some people, some persons, do not understand that vision. They do not see it. They have looked too much upon the ground. They have thought too much of the interests that were near them and they have not listened to the voices of their neighbors. I have never had a moment's doubt as to where the heart and purpose of this people lay. When any one on the other side of the water has raised the question: "Will America come in and help?" I have said: "Of course America will come in and help." She cannot do anything else. She will not disappoint any high hope that has been formed of her. Least of all will she in this day of new-born liberty all over the world fail to extend her hand of support and assistance to those who have been made free.

I wonder if at this distance you can have got any conception of the tragic intensity of the feeling of those peoples in Europe who have just had yokes thrown off them. Have you reckoned up in your mind how many peoples, how many nations, were held unwillingly under the yoke of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, under the yoke of Turkey, under the yoke of Germany? These yokes have been thrown off. These peoples breathe the air and look around to see a new day dawn about them, and whenever they think of what is going to fill that day with action they think first of us. They think first of the friends who through the long years have spoken for them, who were privileged to declare that they came into the war to release them, who said that they would not make peace upon any other terms than their liberty, and they have known that America's presence in the war and in the conference was the guarantee of the result.

The Governor has spoken of a great task ended. Yes, the formulation of the peace is ended, but it creates only a new task just begun. I believe that if you will study the peace you will see that it is a just peace and a peace which, if it can be preserved, will save the world from unnecessary bloodshed. And now the great task is to preserve it. I have come back with my heart full of enthusiasm for throwing everything that I can, by way of influence or action, in with you to see that the peace is preserved—that when the long reckoning comes men may look back upon this generation of America and say: "They were true to the vision which they saw at their birth."

President Wilson's Address to the Senate, Presenting the Peace Treaty

July 10, 1919

Gentlemen of the Senate:

The treaty of peace with Germany was signed at Versailles on the twenty-eighth of June. I avail myself of the earliest opportunity to lay the treaty before you for ratification and to inform you with regard to the work of the Conference by which that treaty was formulated.

The treaty constitutes nothing less than a world settlement. It would not be possible for me either to summarize or to construe its manifold provisions in an address which must of necessity be something less than a treatise. My services and all the information I possess will be at your disposal and at the disposal of your Committee on Foreign Relations at any time, either informally or in session, as you may prefer; and I hope that you will not hesitate to make use of them. I shall at this time, prior to your own study of the document, attempt only a general characterization of its scope and purpose.

In one sense, no doubt, there is no need that I should report to you what was attempted and done at Paris. You have been daily cognizant of what was going on there,—of the problems with which the Peace Conference had to deal and of the difficulty of laying down straight lines of settlement anywhere on a field on which the old lines of international relationship, and the new alike, followed so intricate a pattern and were for the most part cut so deep by historical circumstances which dominated action even where it would have been best to ignore or reverse them. The cross currents of politics and of interest must have been evident to you. It would be presuming in me to attempt to explain the questions which arose or the many diverse elements that entered into them. I shall attempt

something less ambitious than that and more clearly suggested by my duty to report to the Congress the part it seemed necessary for my colleagues and me to play as the representatives of the Government of the United States.

That part was dictated by the rôle America had played in the war and by the expectations that had been created in the minds of the peoples with whom we had associated ourselves in that great struggle.

The United States entered the war upon a different footing from every other nation except our associates on this side the sea. We entered it, not because our material interests were directly threatened or because any special treaty obligations to which we were parties had been violated, but only because we saw the supremacy, and even the validity, of right everywhere put in jeopardy and free government likely to be everywhere imperiled by the intolerable aggression of a power which respected neither right nor obligation and whose very system of government flouted the rights of the citizen as against the autocratic authority of his governors. And in the settlements of the peace we have sought no special reparation for ourselves, but only the restoration of right and the assurance of liberty everywhere that the effects of the settlement were to be felt. We entered the war as the disinterested champions of right and we interested ourselves in the terms of the peace in no other capacity.

The hopes of the nations allied against the Central Powers were at a very low ebb when our soldiers began to pour across the sea. There was everywhere amongst them, except in their stoutest spirits, a sombre foreboding of disaster. The war ended in November, eight months ago, but you have only to recall what was feared in midsummer last, four short months before the Armistice, to realize what it was that our timely aid accomplished alike for their morale and their physical safety. That first, never-to-be-forgotten action at Chateau-Thierry had already

taken place. Our redoubtable soldiers and marines had already closed the gap the enemy had succeeded in opening for their advance upon Paris,—had already turned the tide of battle back towards the frontiers of France and begun the rout that was to save Europe and the world. Thereafter the Germans were to be always forced back, back, were never to thrust successfully forward again. And yet there was no confident hope. Anxious men and women, leading spirits of France, attended the celebration of the Fourth of July last year in Paris out of generous courtesy,—with no heart for festivity, little zest for hope. But they came away with something new at their hearts: they have themselves told us so. The mere sight of our men,—of their vigor, of the confidence that showed itself in every movement of their stalwart figures and every turn of their swinging march, in their steady comprehending eyes and easy discipline, in the indomitable air that added spirit to everything they did,—made everyone who saw them that memorable day realize that something had happened that was much more than a mere incident in the fighting, something very different from the mere arrival of fresh troops. A great moral force had flung itself into the struggle. The fine physical force of those spirited men spoke of something more than bodily vigor. They carried the great ideals of a free people at their hearts and with that vision were unconquerable. Their very presence brought reassurance; their fighting made victory certain.

They were recognized as crusaders, and as their thousands swelled to millions their strength was seen to mean salvation. And they were fit men to carry such a hope and make good the assurance it forecast. Finer men never went into battle; and their officers were worthy of them. This is not the occasion upon which to utter a eulogy of the armies America sent to France, but perhaps, since I am speaking of their mission, I may speak also of the pride I shared with every American who saw or dealt with them

there. They were the sort of men America would wish to be represented by, the sort of men every American would wish to claim as fellow-countrymen and comrades in a great cause. They were terrible in battle, and gentle and helpful out of it, remembering the mothers and the sisters, the wives and the little children at home. They were free men under arms, not forgetting their ideals of duty in the midst of tasks of violence. I am proud to have had the privilege of being associated with them and of calling myself their leader.

But I speak now of what they meant to the men by whose sides they fought and to the people with whom they mingled with such utter simplicity, as friends who asked only to be of service. They were for all the visible embodiment of America. What they did made America and all that she stood for a living reality in the thoughts not only of the people of France but also of tens of millions of men and women throughout all the toiling nations of a world standing everywhere in peril of its freedom and of the loss of everything it held dear, in deadly fear that its bonds were never to be loosed, its hopes forever to be mocked and disappointed.

And the compulsion of what they stood for was upon us who represented America at the peace table. It was our duty to see to it that every decision we took part in contributed, so far as we were able to influence it, to quiet the fears and realize the hopes of the peoples who had been living in that shadow, the nations that had come by our assistance to their freedom. It was our duty to do everything that it was within our power to do to make the triumph of freedom and of right a lasting triumph in the assurance of which men might everywhere live without fear.

Old entanglements of every kind stood in the way,—promises which Governments had made to one another in the days when might and right were confused and the

power of the victor was without restraint. Engagements which contemplated any dispositions of territory, any extensions of sovereignty that might seem to be to the interest of those who had the power to insist upon them, had been entered into without thought of what the peoples concerned might wish or profit by; and these could not always be honorably brushed aside. It was not easy to graft the new order of ideas on the old, and some of the fruits of the grafting may, I fear, for a time be bitter. But, with very few exceptions, the men who sat with us at the peace table desired as sincerely as we did to get away from the bad influences, the illegitimate purposes, the demoralizing ambitions, the international counsels and expedients out of which the sinister designs of Germany had sprung as a natural growth.

It had been our privilege to formulate the principles which were accepted as the basis of the peace, but they had been accepted, not because we had come in to hasten and assure the victory and insisted upon them, but because they were readily acceded to as the principles to which honorable and enlightened minds everywhere had been bred. They spoke the conscience of the world as well as the conscience of America, and I am happy to pay my tribute of respect and gratitude to the able, forward-looking men with whom it was my privilege to cooperate for their unfailing spirit of cooperation, their constant effort to accommodate the interests they represented to the principles we were all agreed upon. The difficulties, which were many, lay in the circumstances, not often in the men. Almost without exception the men who led had caught the true and full vision of the problem of peace as an indivisible whole, a problem not of mere adjustments of interest, but of justice and right action.

The atmosphere in which the Conference worked seemed created, not by the ambitions of strong governments, but by the hopes and aspirations of small nations and of peo-

ples hitherto under bondage to the power that victory had shattered and destroyed. Two great empires had been forced into political bankruptcy, and we were the receivers. Our task was not only to make peace with the central empires and remedy the wrongs their armies had done. The central empires had lived in open violation of many of the very rights for which the war had been fought, dominating alien peoples over whom they had no natural right to rule, enforcing, not obedience, but veritable bondage, exploiting those who were weak for the benefit of those who were masters and overlords only by force of arms. There could be no peace until the whole order of central Europe was set right.

That meant that new nations were to be created,—Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Hungary itself. No part of ancient Poland had ever in any true sense become a part of Germany, or of Austria, or of Russia. Bohemia was alien in every thought and hope to the monarchy of which she had so long been an artificial part; and the uneasy partnership between Austria and Hungary had been one rather of interest than of kinship or sympathy. The Slavs whom Austria had chosen to force into her empire on the south were kept to their obedience by nothing but fear. Their hearts were with their kinsmen in the Balkans. These were all arrangements of power, not arrangements of natural union or association. It was the imperative task of those who would make peace and make it intelligently to establish a new order which would rest upon the free choice of peoples rather than upon the arbitrary authority of Hapsburgs or Hohenzollerns.

More than that, great populations bound by sympathy and actual kin to Rumania were also linked against their will to the conglomerate Austro-Hungarian monarchy or to other alien sovereignties, and it was part of the task of peace to make a new Rumania as well as a new Slavic state clustering about Serbia.

And no natural frontiers could be found to these new fields of adjustment and redemption. It was necessary to look constantly forward to other related tasks. The German colonies were to be disposed of. They had not been governed; they had been exploited merely, without thought of the interest or even the ordinary human rights of their inhabitants.

The Turkish Empire, moreover, had fallen apart, as the Austro-Hungarian had. It had never had any real unity. It had been held together only by pitiless, inhuman force. Its peoples cried aloud for release, for succour from unspeakable distress, for all that the new day of hope seemed at last to bring within its dawn. Peoples hitherto in utter darkness were to be led out into the same light and given at last a helping hand. Undeveloped peoples and peoples ready for recognition but not yet ready to assume the full responsibilities of statehood were to be given adequate guarantees of friendly protection, guidance and assistance.

And out of the execution of these great enterprises of liberty sprang opportunities to attempt what statesmen had never found the way before to do; an opportunity to throw safeguards about the rights of racial, national, and religious minorities by solemn international covenant; an opportunity to limit and regulate military establishments where they were most likely to be mischievous; an opportunity to effect a complete and systematic internationalization of waterways and railways which were necessary to the free economic life of more than one nation and to clear many of the normal channels of commerce of unfair obstructions of law or of privilege; and the very welcome opportunity to secure for labour the concerted protection of definite international pledges of principle and practice.

These were not tasks which the Conference looked about it to find and went out of its way to perform. They were inseparable from the settlements of peace. They were thrust upon it by circumstances which could not be over-

looked. The war had created them. In all quarters of the world old established relationships had been disturbed or broken and affairs were at loose ends, needing to be mended or united again, but could not be made what they were before. They had to be set right by applying some uniform principle of justice or enlightened expediency. And they could not be adjusted by merely prescribing in a treaty what should be done. New states were to be set up which could not hope to live through their first period of weakness without assured support by the great nations that had consented to their creation and won for them their independence. Ill-governed colonies could not be put in the hands of governments which were to act as trustees for their people and not as their masters if there was to be no common authority among the nations to which they were to be responsible in the execution of their trust. Future international conventions with regard to the control of waterways, with regard to illicit traffic of many kinds, in arms or in deadly drugs, or with regard to the adjustment of many varying international administrative arrangements could not be assured if the treaty were to provide no permanent common international agency, if its execution in such matters was to be left to the slow and uncertain processes of cooperation by ordinary methods of negotiation. If the Peace Conference itself was to be the end of cooperative authority and common counsel among the governments to which the world was looking to enforce justice and give pledges of an enduring settlement, regions like the Saar basin could not be put under a temporary administrative régime which did not involve a transfer of political sovereignty and which contemplated a final determination of its political connections by popular vote to be taken at a distant date; no free city like Dantzig could be created which was, under elaborate international guarantees, to accept exceptional obligations with regard to the use of its port and exceptional relations with a State

of which it was not to form a part; properly safeguarded plebescites could not be provided for where populations were at some future date to make choice what sovereignty they would live under; no certain and uniform method of arbitration could be secured for the settlement of anticipated difficulties of final decision with regard to many matters dealt with in the treaty itself; the long-continued supervision of the task of reparation which Germany was to undertake to complete within the next generation might entirely break down; the reconsideration and revision of administrative arrangements and restrictions which the treaty prescribed but which it was recognized might not prove of lasting advantage or entirely fair if too long enforced would be impracticable. The promises governments were making to one another about the way in which labour was to be dealt with, by law not only but in fact as well, would remain a mere humane thesis if there was to be no common tribunal of opinion and judgment to which liberal statesmen could resort for the influences which alone might secure their redemption. A league of free nations had become a practical necessity. Examine the treaty of peace and you will find that everywhere throughout its manifold provisions its framers have felt obliged to turn to the League of Nations as an indispensable instrumentality for the maintenance of the new order it has been their purpose to set up in the world,—the world of civilized men.

That there should be a league of nations to steady the counsels and maintain the peaceful understandings of the world, to make, not treaties alone, but the accepted principles of international law as well, the actual rule of conduct among the governments of the world, had been one of the agreements accepted from the first as the basis of peace with the Central Powers. The statesmen of all the belligerent countries were agreed that such a league must be created to sustain the settlements that were to be

effected. But at first I think there was a feeling among some of them that, while it must be attempted, the formation of such a league was perhaps a counsel of perfection which practical men, long experienced in the world of affairs, must agree to very cautiously and with many misgivings. It was only as the difficult work of arranging an all but universal adjustment of the world's affairs advanced from day to day from one stage of conference to another that it became evident to them that what they were seeking would be little more than something written upon paper, to be interpreted and applied by such methods as the chances of politics might make available if they did not provide a means of common counsel which all were obliged to accept, a common authority whose decisions would be recognized as decisions which all must respect.

And so the most practical, the most skeptical among them turned more and more to the League as the authority through which international action was to be secured, the authority without which, as they had come to see it, it would be difficult to give assured effect either to this treaty or to any other international understanding upon which they were to depend for the maintenance of peace. The fact that the covenant of the League was the first substantive part of the treaty to be worked out and agreed upon, while all else was in solution, helped to make the formulation of the rest easier. The Conference was, after all, not to be ephemeral. The concert of nations was to continue, under a definite covenant which had been agreed upon and which all were convinced was workable. They could go forward with confidence to make arrangements intended to be permanent. The most practical of the conferees were at last the most ready to refer to the League of Nations the superintendence of all interests which did not admit of immediate determination, of all administrative problems which were to require a continuing oversight. What had seemed a counsel of perfection had come

to seem a plain counsel of necessity. The League of Nations was the practical statesman's hope of success in many of the most difficult things he was attempting.

And it had validated itself in the thought of every member of the Conference as something much bigger, much greater every way, than a mere instrument for carrying out the provisions of a particular treaty. It was universally recognized that all the peoples of the world demanded of the Conference that it should create such a continuing concert of free nations as would make wars of aggression and spoliation such as this that has just ended forever impossible. A cry had gone out from every home in every stricken land from which sons and brothers and fathers had gone forth to the great sacrifice that such a sacrifice should never again be exacted. It was manifest why it had been exacted. It had been exacted because one nation desired dominion and other nations had known no means of defence except armaments and alliances. War had lain at the heart of every arrangement of the Europe,—of every arrangement of the world,—that preceded the war. Restive peoples had been told that fleets and armies, which they toiled to sustain, meant peace; and they now knew that they had been lied to: that fleets and armies had been maintained to promote national ambitions and meant war. They knew that no old policy meant anything else but force, force,—always force. And they knew that it was intolerable. Every true heart in the world, and every enlightened judgment, demanded that, at whatever cost of independent action, every government that took thought for its people or for justice or for ordered freedom should lend itself to a new purpose and utterly destroy the old order of international politics. Statesmen might see difficulties, but the people could see none and could brook no denial. A war in which they had been bled white to beat the terror that lay concealed in every Balance of Power must not end in a mere victory of arms and a new balance.

The monster that had resorted to arms must be put in chains that could not be broken. The united power of free nations must put a stop to aggression, and the world must be given peace. If there was not the will or the intelligence to accomplish that now, there must be another and a final war and the world must be swept clean of every power that could renew the terror. The League of Nations was not merely an instrument to adjust and remedy old wrongs under a new treaty of peace; it was the only hope for mankind. Again and again had the demon of war been cast out of the house of the peoples and the house swept clean by a treaty of peace, only to prepare a time when he would enter in again with spirits worse than himself. The house must now be given a tenant who could hold it against all such. Convenient, indeed indispensable, as statesmen found the newly planned League of Nations to be for the execution of present plans of peace and reparation, they saw it in a new aspect before their work was finished. They saw it as the main object of the peace, as the only thing that could complete it or make it worth while. They saw it as the hope of the world, and that hope they did not dare to disappoint. Shall we or any other free people hesitate to accept this great duty? Dare we reject it and break the heart of the world?

And so the result of the Conference of Peace, so far as Germany is concerned, stands complete. The difficulties encountered were very many. Sometimes they seemed insuperable. It was impossible to accommodate the interests of so great a body of nations,—interests which directly or indirectly affected almost every nation in the world,—without many minor compromises. The treaty, as a result, is not exactly what we would have written. It is probably not what any one of the national delegations would have written. But results were worked out which on the whole bear test. I think that it will be found that the compromises which were accepted as inevitable nowhere cut

to the heart of any principle. The work of the Conference squares, as a whole, with the principles agreed upon as the basis of the peace as well as with the practical possibilities of the international situations which had to be faced and dealt with as facts.

I shall presently have occasion to lay before you a special treaty with France, whose object is the temporary protection of France from unprovoked aggression by the Power with whom this treaty of peace has been negotiated. Its terms link it with this treaty. I take the liberty, however, of reserving it for special explication on another occasion.

The rôle which America was to play in the Conference seemed determined, as I have said, before my colleagues and I got to Paris,—determined by the universal expectations of the nations whose representatives, drawn from all quarters of the globe, we were to deal with. It was universally recognized that America had entered the war to promote n private or peculiar interest of her own but only as the champion of rights which she was glad to share with free men and lovers of justice everywhere. We had formulated the principles upon which the settlement was to be made,—the principles upon which the Armistice had been agreed to and the parleys of peace undertaken,—and no one doubted that our desire was to see the treaty of peace formulated along the actual lines of those principles,—and desired nothing else. We were welcomed as disinterested friends. We were resorted to as arbiters in many a difficult matter. It was recognized that our material aid would be indispensable in the days to come, when industry and credit would have to be brought back to their normal operation again and communities beaten to the ground assisted to their feet once more, and it was taken for granted, I am proud to say, that we would play the helpful friend in these things as in all others without prejudice or favor. We were generously accepted as the

unaffected champions of what was right. It was a very responsible rôle to play; but I am happy to report that the fine group of Americans who helped with their expert advice in each part of the varied settlements sought in every transaction to justify the high confidence reposed in them.

And that confidence, it seems to me, is the measure of our opportunity and of our duty in the days to come, in which the new hope of the peoples of the world is to be fulfilled or disappointed. The fact that America is the friend of the nations, whether they be rivals or associates, is no new fact: it is only the discovery of it by the rest of the world that is new.

America may be said to have just reached her majority as a world power. It was almost exactly twenty-one years ago that the results of the war with Spain put us unexpectedly in possession of rich islands on the other side of the world and brought us into association with other governments in the control of the West Indies. It was regarded as a sinister and ominous thing by the statesmen of more than one European chancellory that we should have extended our power beyond the confines of our continental dominions. They were accustomed to think of new neighbors as a new menace, of rivals as watchful enemies. There were persons amongst us at home who looked with deep disapproval and avowed anxiety on such extensions of our national authority over distant islands and over peoples whom they feared we might exploit, not serve and assist. But we have not exploited them. We have been their friends and have sought to serve them. And our dominion has been a menace to no other nation. We redeemed our honor to the utmost in our dealings with Cuba. She is weak but absolutely free; and it is her trust in us that makes her free. Weak peoples everywhere stand ready to give us any authority among them that will assure them a like friendly oversight and direction. They know

that there is no ground for fear in receiving us as their mentors and guides. Our isolation was ended twenty years ago; and now fear of us is ended also, our counsel and association sought after and desired. There can be no question of our ceasing to be a world power. The only question is whether we can refuse the moral leadership that is offered us, whether we shall accept or reject the confidence of the world.

The war and the Conference of Peace now sitting in Paris seem to me to have answered that question. Our participation in the war established our position among the nations and nothing but our own mistaken action can alter it. It was not an accident or a matter of sudden choice that we are no longer isolated and devoted to a policy which has only our own interest and advantage for its object. It was our duty to go in, if we were indeed the champions of liberty and of right. We answered to the call of duty in a way so spirited, so utterly without thought of what we spent of blood or treasure, so effective, so worthy of the admiration of true men everywhere, so wrought out of the stuff of all that was heroic, that the whole world saw at last, in the flesh, in noble action, a great ideal asserted and vindicated, by a nation they had deemed material and now found to be compact of the spiritual forces that must free men of every nation from every unworthy bondage. It is thus that a new rôle and a new responsibility have come to this great nation that we honor and which we would all wish to lift to yet higher levels of service and achievement.

The stage is set, the destiny disclosed. It has come about by no plan of our conceiving, but by the hand of God who led us into this way. We cannot turn back. We can only go forward, with lifted eyes and freshened spirit, to follow the vision. It was of this that we dreamed at our birth. America shall in truth show the way. The light streams upon the path ahead, and nowhere else.

President Wilson's Address to Congress on the Cost of Living

August 8, 1919

Gentlemen of the Congress:

I have sought this opportunity to address you because it is clearly my duty to call your attention to the present cost of living and to urge upon you with all the persuasive force of which I am capable the legislative measures which would be most effective in controlling it and bringing it down. The prices the people of this country are paying for everything that it is necessary for them to use in order to live are not justified by a shortage in supply, either present or prospective, and are in many cases artificially and deliberately created by vicious practices which ought immediately to be checked by law. They constitute a burden upon us which is the more unbearable because we know that it is wilfully imposed by those who have the power and that it can by vigorous public action be greatly lightened and made to square with the actual conditions of supply and demand. Some of the methods by which these prices are produced are already illegal, some of them criminal, and those who employ them will be energetically proceeded against; but others have not yet been brought under the law and should be dealt with at once by legislation.

I need not recite the particulars of this critical matter: the prices demanded and paid at the sources of supply, at the factory, in the food markets, at the shops, in the restaurants and hotels, alike in the city and in the village. They are familiar to you. They are the talk of every domestic circle and of every group of casual acquaintances even. It is a matter of familiar knowledge, also, that a process has set in which is likely, unless something is done, to push prices and rents and the whole cost of living higher and yet higher, in a vicious cycle to which there is no logical or natural end. With the increase in the prices of

the necessaries of life come demands for increases in wages,—demands which are justified if there be no other means of enabling men to live. Upon the increase of wages there follows close an increase in the price of the products whose producers have been accorded the increase,—not a proportionate increase, for the manufacturer does not content himself with that, but an increase considerably greater than the added wage cost and for which the added wage cost is oftentimes hardly more than an excuse. The labourers who do not get an increase in pay when they demand it are likely to strike, and the strike only makes matters worse. It checks production. If it affects the railways it prevents distribution and strips the markets, so that there is presently nothing to buy, and there is another excessive addition to prices resulting from the scarcity.

These are facts and forces with which we have become only too familiar; but we are not justified because of our familiarity with them or because of any hasty and shallow conclusion that they are "natural" and inevitable in sitting inactively by and letting them work their fatal results if there is anything that we can do to check, correct, or reverse them. I have sought this opportunity to inform the Congress what the Executive is doing by way of remedy and control, and to suggest where effective legal remedies are lacking and may be supplied.

We must, I think, frankly admit that there is no complete immediate remedy to be had from legislative and executive action. The free processes of supply and demand will not operate of themselves and no legislative or executive action can force them into full and natural operation until there is peace. There is now neither peace nor war. All the world is waiting,—with what unnerving fears and haunting doubts who can adequately say?—waiting to know when it shall have peace and what kind of peace it will be when it comes,—a peace in which each nation shall make shift for itself as it can, or a peace buttressed and sup-

ported by the will and concert of the nations that have the purpose and the power to do and to enforce what is right. Politically, economically, socially the world is on the operating table, and it has not been possible to administer any anesthetic. It is conscious. It even watches the capital operation upon which it knows that its hope of healthful life depends. It cannot think its business out or make plans or give intelligent and provident direction to its affairs while in such a case. Where there is no peace of mind there can be no energy in endeavor. There can be no confidence in industry, no calculable basis for credits, no confident buying or systematic selling, no certain prospect of employment, no normal restoration of business, no hopeful attempt at reconstruction or the proper reassembling of the dislocated elements of enterprise until peace has been established and, so far as may be, guaranteed.

Our national life has no doubt been less radically disturbed and dismembered than the national life of other peoples whom the war more directly affected, with all its terrible ravaging and destructive force, but it has been, nevertheless, profoundly affected and disarranged, and our industries, our credits, our productive capacity, our economic processes are inextricably interwoven with those of other nations and peoples,—most intimately of all with the nations and peoples upon whom the chief burden and confusion of the war fell and who are now most dependent upon the cooperative action of the world.

We are just now shipping more goods out of our ports to foreign markets than we ever shipped before,—not food stuffs merely, but stuffs and materials of every sort; but this is no index of what our foreign sales will continue to be or of the effect the volume of our exports will have on supplies and prices. It is impossible yet to predict how far or how long foreign purchasers will be able to find the money or the credit to pay for or sustain such purchases on such a scale; how soon or to what extent foreign man-

ufacturers can resume their former production, foreign farmers get their accustomed crops from their own fields, foreign mines resume their former output, foreign merchants set up again their old machinery of trade with the ends of the earth. All these things must remain uncertain until peace is established and the nations of the world have concerted the methods by which normal life and industry are to be restored. All that we shall do, in the meantime, to restrain profiteering and put the life of our people upon a tolerable footing will be makeshift and provisional. There can be no settled conditions here or elsewhere until the treaty of peace is out of the way and the work of liquidating the war has become the chief concern of our government and of the other governments of the world. Until then business will inevitably remain speculative and sway now this way and again that, with heavy losses or heavy gains as it may chance, and the consumer must take care of both the gains and the losses. There can be no peace prices so long as our whole financial and economic sytsem is on a war basis.

Europe will not, can not recoup her capital or put her restless, distracted peoples to work until she knows exactly where she stands in respect of peace; and what we will do is for her the chief question upon which her quietude of mind and confidence of purpose depend. While there is any possibility that the peace terms may be changed or may be held long in abeyance or may not be enforced because of divisions of opinion among the powers associated against Germany, it is idle to look for permanent relief.

But what we can do we should do, and should do at once. And there is a great deal that we can do, provisional though it be. Wheat shipments and credits to facilitate the purchase of our wheat can and will be limited and controlled in such a way as not to raise but rather to lower the price of flour here. The Government has the power,

within certain limits, to regulate that. We cannot deny wheat to foreign peoples who are in dire need of it, and we do not wish to do so; but, fortunately, though the wheat crop is not what we hoped it would be, it is abundant if handled with provident care. The price of wheat is lower in the United States than in Europe, and can with proper management be kept so.

By way of immediate relief, surplus stocks of both food and clothing in the hands of the Government will be sold, and of course sold at prices at which there is no profit. And by way of a more permanent correction of prices surplus stocks in private hands will be drawn out of storage and put upon the market. Fortunately, under the terms of the Food Control Act the hoarding of food stuffs can be checked and prevented; and they will be, with the greatest energy. Food stuffs can be drawn out of storage and sold by legal action which the Department of Justice will institute wherever necessary; but so soon as the situation is systematically dealt with it is not likely that the courts will often have to be resorted to. Much of the accumulating of stocks has no doubt been due to the sort of speculation which always results from uncertainty. Great surpluses were accumulated because it was impossible to foresee what the market would disclose and dealers were determined to be ready for whatever might happen, as well as eager to reap the full advantage of rising prices. They will now see the disadvantage, as well as the danger, of holding off from the new process of distribution.

Some very interesting and significant facts with regard to stocks on hand and the rise of prices in the face of abundance have been disclosed by the inquiries of the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labour and the Federal Trade Commission. They seem to justify the statement that in the case of many necessary commodities effective means have been found to prevent the normal operation of the law of supply and demand. Disregarding

the surplus stocks in the hands of the Government, there was a greater supply of food stuffs in this country on June 1st of this year than at the same date last year. In the combined total of a number of the most important foods in dry and cold storage the excess is quite 19 per cent. And yet prices have risen. The supply of fresh eggs on hand in June of this year, for example, was greater by nearly 10 per cent. than the supply on hand at the same time last year and yet the wholesale price was forty cents a dozen as against thirty cents a year ago. The stock of frozen fowls had increased more than 298 per cent., and yet the price had risen also, from thirty-four and a half cents per pound to thirty-seven and a half cents. The supply of creamery butter had increased 129 per cent. and the price from forty-one to fifty-three cents per pound. The supply of salt beef had been augmented 3 per cent. and the price had gone up from thirty-four dollars a barrel to thirty-six dollars a barrel. Canned corn had increased in stock nearly 92 per cent. and had remained substantially the same in price. In a few food stuffs the prices had declined, but in nothing like the proportion in which the supply had increased. For example, the stock of canned tomatoes had increased 102 per cent. and yet the price had declined only twenty-five cents per dozen cans. In some cases there had been the usual result of an increase of price following a decrease of supply, but in almost every instance the increase of price had been disproportionate to the decrease in stock.

The Attorney General has been making a careful study of the situation as a whole and of the laws that can be applied to better it and is convinced that, under the stimulation and temptation of exceptional circumstances, combinations of producers and combinations of traders have been formed for the control of supplies and of prices which are clearly in restraint of trade, and against these prosecutions will be promptly instituted and actively

pushed which will in all likelihood have a prompt corrective effect. There is reason to believe that the prices of leather, of coal, of lumber, and of textiles have been materially affected by forms of concert and cooperation among the producers and marketers of these and other universally necessary commodities which it will be possible to redress. No watchful or energetic effort will be spared to accomplish this necessary result. I trust that there will not be many cases in which prosecution will be necessary. Public action will no doubt cause many who have perhaps unwittingly adopted illegal methods to abandon them promptly and of their own motion.

And publicity can accomplish a great deal. The purchaser can often take care of himself if he knows the facts and influences he is dealing with; and purchasers are not disinclined to do anything, either singly or collectively, that may be necessary for their self-protection. The Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labour, and the Federal Trade Commission can do a great deal towards supplying the public, systematically and at short intervals, with information regarding the actual supply of particular commodities that is in existence and available, with regard to supplies which are in existence but not available because of hoarding, and with regard to the methods of price fixing which are being used by dealers in certain food stuffs and other necessaries. There can be little doubt that retailers are in part,—sometimes in large part,—responsible for exorbitant prices; and it is quite practicable for the Government, through the agencies I have mentioned, to supply the public with full information as to the prices at which retailers buy and as to the costs of transportation they pay, in order that it may be known just what margin of profit they are demanding. Opinion and concerted action on the part of purchasers can probably do the rest.

That is, these agencies may perform this indispensable

service provided the Congress will supply them with the necessary funds to prosecute their inquiries and keep their price lists up to date. Hitherto the Appropriation Committees of the Houses have not always, I fear, seen the full value of these inquiries, and the Departments and Commissions have been very much straitened for means to render this service. That adequate funds be provided by appropriation for this purpose, and provided as promptly as possible, is one of the means of greatly ameliorating the present distressing conditions of livelihood that I have come to urge, in this attempt to concert with you the best ways to serve the country in this emergency. It is one of the absolutely necessary means, underlying many others, and can be supplied at once.

There are many other ways. Existing law is inadequate. There are many perfectly legitimate methods by which the Government can exercise restraint and guidance.

Let me urge, in the first place, that the present food control Act should be extended both as to the period of time during which it shall remain in operation and as to the commodities to which it shall apply. Its provisions against hoarding should be made to apply not only to food but also to feed stuffs, to fuel, to clothing, and to many other commodities which are indisputably necessaries of life. As it stands now it is limited in operation to the perod of the war and becomes inoperative upon the formal proclamation of peace. But I should judge that it was clearly within the constitutional power of the Congress to make similar permanent provisions and regulations with regard to all goods destined for interstate commerce and to exclude them from interstate shipment if the requirements of the law are not complied with. Some such regulation is imperatively necessary. The abuses that have grown up in the manipulation of prices by the withholding of food stuffs and other necessaries of life cannot otherwise be effectively prevented. There can be no doubt of

either the necessity or the legitimacy of such measures. May I not call attention to the fact, also, that, although the present Act prohibits profiteering, the prohibition is accompanied by no penalty. It is clearly in the public interest that a penalty should be provided which will be persuasive.

To the same end, I earnestly recommend, in the second place, that the Congress pass a law regulating cold storage as it is regulated, for example, by the laws of the State of New Jersey, which limit the time during which goods may be kept in storage, prescribe the method of disposing of them if kept beyond the permitted period, and require that goods released from storage shall in all cases bear the date of their receipt. It would materially add to the serviceability of the law, for the purpose we now have in view, if it were also prescribed that all goods released from storage for interstate shipment should have plainly marked upon each package the selling or market price at which they went into storage. By this means the purchaser would always be able to learn what profits stood between him and the producer or the wholesale dealer.

It would serve as a useful example to the other communities of the country, as well as greatly relieve local distress, if the Congress were to regulate all such matters very fully for the District of Columbia, where its legislative authority is without limit.

I would also recommend that it be required that all goods destined for interstate commerce should in every case where their form or package makes it possible be plainly marked with the price at which they left the hands of the producer. Such a requirement would bear a close analogy to certain provisions of the Pure Food Act, by which it is required that certain detailed information be given on the labels of packages of foods and drugs.

And it does not seem to me that we can confine ourselves to detailed measures of this kind, if it is indeed our

purpose to assume national control of the processes of distribution. I take it for granted that that is our purpose and our duty. Nothing less will suffice. We need not hesitate to handle a national question in a national way. We should go beyond the measures I have suggested. We should formulate a law requiring a federal license of all corporations engaged in interstate commerce and embodying in the license, or in the conditions under which it is to be issued, specific regulations designed to secure competitive selling and prevent unconscionable profits in the method of marketing. Such a law would afford a welcome opportunity to effect other such needed reforms in the business of interstate shipment and in the methods of corporations which are engaged in it; but for the moment I confine my recommendations to the object immediately in hand, which is to lower the cost of living.

May I not add that there is a bill now pending before the Congress which, if passed, would do much to stop speculation and to prevent the fraudulent methods of promotion by which our people are annually fleeced of many millions of hard-earned money. I refer to the measure proposed by the Capital Issues Committee for the control of security issues. It is a measure formulated by men who know the actual conditions of business and its adoption would serve a great and beneficent purpose.

We are dealing, Gentlemen of the Congress, I need hardly say, with very critical and very difficult matters. We should go forward with confidence along the road we see, but we should also seek to comprehend the whole of the scene amidst which we act. There is no ground for some of the fearful forecasts I hear uttered about me, but the condition of the world is unquestionably very grave and we should face it comprehendingly. The situation of our own country is exceptionally fortunate. We of all peoples can afford to keep our heads and to determine upon moderate and sensible courses of action which will ensure us

against the passions and distempers which are working such deep unhappiness for some of the distressed nations on the other side of the sea. But we may be involved in their distresses unless we help, and help with energy and intelligence.

The world must pay for the appalling destruction wrought by the Great War, and we are part of the world. We must pay our share. For five years now the industry of all Europe has been slack and disordered. The normal crops have not been produced; the normal quantity of manufactured goods has not been turned out. Not until there are the usual crops and the usual production of manufactured goods on the other side of the Atlantic can Europe return to the former conditions; and it was upon the former conditions, not the present, that our economic relations with Europe were built up. We must face the fact that unless we help Europe to get back to her normal life and production a chaos will ensue there which will inevitably be communicated to this country. For the present, it is manifest, we must quicken, not slacken our own production. We, and we almost alone, now hold the world steady. Upon our steadfastness and self-possession depend the affairs of nations everywhere. It is in this supreme crisis,—this crisis for all mankind,—that America must prove her mettle. In the presence of a world confused, distracted, she must show herself self-possessed, self-contained, capable of sober and effective action. She saved Europe by her action in arms; she must now save it by her action in peace. In saving Europe she will save herself, as she did upon the battlefields of the war. The calmness and capacity with which she deals with and masters the problems of peace will be the final test and proof of her place among the peoples of the world.

And, if only in our own interest, we must help the people over seas. Europe is our biggest customer. We must

keep her going or thousands of our shops and scores of our mines must close. There is no such thing as letting her go to ruin without ourselves sharing in the disaster.

In such circumstances, face to face with such tests, passion must be discarded. Passion and a disregard for the rights of others have no place in the counsels of a free people. We need light, not heat, in these solemn times of self-examination and saving action. There must be no threats. Let there be only intelligent counsel, and let the best reasons win, not the strongest brute force. The world has just destroyed the arbitrary force of a military junta. It will live under no other. All that is arbitrary and coercive is in the discard. Those who seek to employ it only prepare their own destruction.

We cannot hastily and over night revolutionize all the process of our economic life. We shall not attempt to do so. These are days of deep excitement and of extravagant speech; but with us these are things of the surface. Everyone who is in real touch with the silent masses of our great people knows that the old strong fibre and steady self-control are still there, firm against violence or any distempered action that would throw their affairs into confusion. I am serenely confident that they will readily find themselves, no matter what the circumstances, and that they will address themselves to the tasks of peace with the same devotion and the same stalwart preference for what is right that they displayed to the admiration of the whole world in the midst of war.

And I entertain another confident hope. I have spoken to-day chiefly of measures of imperative regulation and legal compulsion, of prosecutions and the sharp correction of selfish processes; and these, no doubt, are necessary. But there are other forces that we may count on besides those resident in the Department of Justice. We have just fully awakened to what has been going on and to the influences, many of them very selfish and sinister, that have

been producing high prices and imposing an intolerable burden on the mass of our people. To have brought it all into the open will accomplish the greater part of the result we seek. I appeal with entire confidence to our producers, our middlemen, and our merchants to deal fairly with the people. It is their opportunity to show that they comprehend, that they intend to act justly, and that they have the public interest sincerely at heart. And I have no doubt that housekeepers all over the country, and everyone who buys the things he daily stands in need of will presently exercise a greater vigilance, a more thoughtful economy, a more discriminating care as to the market in which he buys or the merchant with whom he trades than he has hitherto exercised.

I believe, too, that the more extreme leaders of organized labor will presently yield to a sober second thought and, like the great mass of their associates, think and act like true Americans. They will see that strikes undertaken at this critical time are certain to make matters worse, not better,—worse for them and for everybody else. The worst thing, the most fatal thing that can be done now is to stop or interrupt production or to interfere with the distribution of goods by the railways and the shipping of the country. We are all involved in the distressing results of the high cost of living and we must unite, not divide, to correct it. There are many things that ought to be corrected in the relations between capital and labor, in respect of wages and conditions of labor and other things even more far-reaching, and I, for one, am ready to go into conference about these matters with any group of my fellow countrymen who know what they are talking about and are willing to remedy existing conditions by frank counsel rather than by violent contest. No remedy is possible while men are in a temper, and there can be no settlement which does not have as its motive and standard the general interest. Threats and undue insistence upon

the interest of a single class make settlement impossible. I believe, as I have hitherto had occasion to say to the Congress, that the industry and life of our people and of the world will suffer irreparable damage if employers and workmen are to go on in a perpetual contest, as antagonists. They must on one plan or another, be effectively associated. Have we not steadiness and self-possession and business sense enough to work out that result? Undoubtedly we have, and we shall work it out. In the meantime —now and in the days of readjustment and recuperation that are ahead of us,—let us resort more and more to frank and intimate counsel and make ourselves a great and triumphant Nation by making ourselves a united force in the life of the world. It will not then have looked to us for leadership in vain.

[Editorial Note: *While President Wilson had been absent in Europe—nearly seven months, on the two trips—the Senate at Washington had been restive and critical. There had been objection to Wilson's own membership on the peace commission, as well as to his failure to include a Senator. During the latter half of his absence the Republicans were in control of the Senate and thus held a majority in the Foreign Relations Committee.*

As the weeks passed the debate at Washington grew ever more intense—based on cabled news reports, for the President did not consult or even communicate with the Senate. As an instance: The completed Treaty of Peace was handed to the Germans on May 7 and a brief official summary of its provisions was made public; but it was more than a month later when a Republican Senator produced a private copy of the full text and had it printed in the "Congressional Record."

President Wilson returned to the United States on July 8, having sailed from France the day after the Peace Treaty was signed. He placed the document before the Senate on July 10, and for the next two months the Covenant of the League of Nations and the Treaty itself were debated in the Committee on Foreign Relations and on the floor of the Senate. Amendments and reservations were proposed.

In an effort to arouse support throughout the country, the President set forth, on September 4, on a speech-making tour which carried him to the Pacific Coast and back.]

[Editorial Note: *Up to this point the addresses of President Wilson have been printed here without abridgment. But for the convenience of the reader there has been some slight condensation in the four-hundred pages that follow, containing speeches delivered on a three-weeks' western tour. The speaker necessarily repeated some points, over and over again, and told the same anecdotes to different audiences. Thus there was opportunity to eliminate a paragraph or two from many of these western speeches so that the material would not seem wholly out of proportion to the remainder of the volume.*]

ADDRESSES OF PRESIDENT WILSON ON HIS WESTERN TOUR

Discussing the League of Nations and the Treaty of Peace with Germany

September 4 to 25, 1919

Address at Columbus, Ohio, September 4, 1919

Mr. Chairman, Governor Campbell, My Fellow Citizens:

It is with very profound pleasure that I find myself face to face with you. I have for a long time chafed at the confinement of Washington. I have for a long time wished to fulfill the purpose with which my heart was full when I returned to our beloved country, namely, to go out and report to my fellow countrymen concerning those affairs of the world which now need to be settled. The only people I owe any report to are you and the other citizens of the United States.

And it has become increasingly necessary, apparently, that I should report to you. After all the various angles at which you have heard the treaty held up, perhaps you would like to know what is in the treaty. I find it very difficult in reading some of the speeches that I have read to form any conception of that great document. It is a document unique in the history of the world for many reasons, and I think I can not do you a better service, or the peace of the

world a better service, than by pointing out to you just what this treaty contains and what it seeks to do.

In the first place, my fellow countrymen, it seeks to punish one of the greatest wrongs ever done in history, the wrong which Germany sought to do to the world and to civilization; and there ought to be no weak purpose with regard to the application of the punishment. She attempted an intolerable thing, and she must be made to pay for the attempt. The terms of the treaty are severe, but they are not unjust. I can testify that the men associated with me at the peace conference in Paris had it in their hearts to do justice and not wrong. But they knew, perhaps, with a more vivid sense of what had happened than we could possibly know on this side of the water, the many solemn covenants which Germany had disregarded, the long preparation she had made to overwhelm her neighbors, and the utter disregard which she had shown for human rights, for the rights of women, of children, of those who were helpless. They had seen their lands devasted by an enemy that devoted himself not only to the effort at victory, but to the effort at terror—seeking to terrify the people whom he fought. And I wish to testify that they exercised restraint in the terms of this treaty. They did not wish to overwhelm any great nation. They acknowledged that Germany was a great nation, and they had no purpose of overwhelming the German people, but they did think that it ought to be burned into the consciousness of men forever that no people ought to permit its government to do what the German Government did.

In the last analysis, my fellow countrymen, as we in America would be the first to claim, a people are responsible for the acts of their government. If their government purposes things that are wrong, they ought to take measures to see to it that that purpose is not executed. Germany was self-governed; her rulers had not concealed the purposes that they had in mind, but they had deceived their people

as to the character of the methods they were going to use, and I believe from what I can learn that there is an awakened consciousness in Germany itself of the deep iniquity of the thing that was attempted. When the Austrian delegates came before the peace conference, they in so many words spoke of the origination of the war as a crime and admitted in our presence that it was a thing intolerable to contemplate. They knew in their hearts that it had done them the deepest conceivable wrong, that it had put their people and the people of Germany at the judgment seat of mankind, and throughout this treaty every term that was applied to Germany was meant, not to humiliate Germany, but to rectify the wrong that she had done.

Look even into the severe terms of reparation—for there was no indemnity. No indemnity of any sort was claimed, merely reparation, merely paying for the destruction done, merely making good the losses so far as such losses could be made good which she had unjustly inflicted, not upon the governments, but upon the people whose rights she had trodden upon with absolute absence of everything that even resembled pity. There was no indemnity in this treaty, but there is reparation, and even in the terms of reparation a method is devised by which the reparation shall be adjusted to Germany's ability to pay it.

I am astonished at some of the statements I hear made about this treaty. The truth is that they are made by persons who have not read the treaty or who, if they have read it, have not comprehended its meaning. There is a method of adjustment in that treaty by which the reparation shall not be pressed beyond the point which Germany can pay, but which will be pressed to the utmost point that Germany can pay—which is just, which is righteous. It would have been intolerable if there had been anything else. For, my fellow citizens, this treaty is not meant merely to end this single war. It is meant as a notice to every government which in the future will attempt this thing that mankind

will unite to inflict the same punishment. There is no national triumph sought to be recorded in this treaty. There is no glory sought for any particular nation. The thought of the statesmen collected around that table was of their people, of the sufferings that they had gone through, of the losses they had incurred—that great throbbing heart which was so depressed, so forlorn, so sad in every memory that it had had of the five tragical years that have gone. Let us never forget those years, my fellow countrymen. Let us never forget the purpose—the high purpose, the disinterested purpose—with which America lent its strength not for its own glory but for the defense of mankind.

As I said, this treaty was not intended merely to end this war. It was intended to prevent any similar war. I wonder if some of the opponents of the League of Nations have forgotten the promises we made our people before we went to that peace table. We had taken by processes of law the flower of our youth from every household, and we told those mothers and fathers and sisters and wives and sweethearts that we were taking those men to fight a war which would end business of that sort; and if we do not end it, if we do not do the best that human concert of action can do to end it, we are of all men the most unfaithful, the most unfaithful to the loving hearts who suffered in this war, the most unfaithful to those households bowed in grief and yet lifted with the feeling that the lad laid down his life for a great thing and, among other things, in order that other lads might never have to do the same thing. That is what the League of Nations is for, to end this war justly, and then not merely to serve notice on governments which would contemplate the same things that Germany contemplated that they will do it at their peril, but also concerning the combination of power which will prove to them that they will do it at their peril. The League of Nations is the only thing that can prevent the recurrence of this dreadful catastrophe and redeem our promises.

The character of the League is based upon the experience of this very war. I did not meet a single public man who did not admit these things, that Germany would not have gone into this war if she had thought Great Britain was going into it, and that she most certainly would never have gone into this war if she dreamed America was going into it. And they all admitted that a notice beforehand that the greatest powers of the world would combine to prevent this sort of thing would prevent it absolutely. When gentlemen tell you, therefore, that the League of Nations is intended for some other purpose than this, merely reply this to them: If we do not do this thing, we have neglected the central covenant that we made to our people, and there will then be no statesmen of any country who can thereafter promise his people alleviation from the perils of war. The passions of this world are not dead. The rivalries of this world have not cooled. They have been rendered hotter than ever. The harness that is to unite nations is more necessary now than it ever was before, and unless there is this assurance of combined action, wrong will be attempted just so soon as the most ambitious nations can recover from the financial stress of this war.

Now, look what else is in the treaty. This treaty is unique in the history of mankind, because the center of it is the redemption of weak nations. There never was a congress of nations before that considered the rights of those who could not enforce their rights. There never was a congress of nations before that did not seek to effect some balance of power brought about by means of serving the strength and interest of the strongest powers concerned; whereas this treaty builds up nations that never could have won their freedom in any other way; builds them up by gift, by largess, not by obligations; builds them up because of the conviction of the men who wrote the treaty that the rights of people transcend the rights of governments, because of the conviction of the men who wrote that treaty that the

fertile source of war is wrong. The Austro-Hungarian Empire, for example, was held together by military force and consisted of peoples who did not want to live together, who did not have the spirit of nationality as toward each other, who were constantly chafing at the bands that held them. Hungary, though a willing partner of Austria, was willing to be a partner because she could share Austria's strength to accomplish her own ambitions, and her own ambitions were to hold under her the Jugo-Slavic peoples that lay to the south of her; Bohemia, an unhappy partner, a partner by duress, beating in all her veins the strongest national impulse that was to be found anywhere in Europe; and north of that, pitiful Poland, a great nation divided up among the great powers of Europe, torn asunder, kinship disregarded, natural ties treated with contempt, and an obligatory division among sovereigns imposed upon her—a part of her given to Russia, a part of her given to Austria, a part of her given to Germany—great bodies of Polish people never permitted to have the normal intercourse with their kinsmen for fear that that fine instinct of the heart should assert itself which binds families together. Poland could never have won her independence. Bohemia never could have broken away from the Austro-Hungarian combination. The Slavic peoples to the south, running down into the great Balkan Peninsula, had again and again tried to assert their nationality and independence, and had as often been crushed, not by the immediate power they were fighting, but by the combined power of Europe. The old alliances, the old balances of power, were meant to see to it that no little nation asserted its right to the disturbance of the peace of Europe, and every time an assertion of rights was attempted they were suppressed by combined influence and force.

This treaty tears away all that: says these people have a right to live their own lives under the governments which they themselves choose to set up. That is the American

principle, and I was glad to fight for it. When strategic claims were urged, it was matter of common counsel that such considerations were not in our thought. We were not now arranging for future wars. We were giving people what belonged to them. My fellow citizens, I do not think there is any man alive who has a more tender sympathy for the great people of Italy than I have, and a very stern duty was presented to us when we had to consider some of the claims of Italy on the Adriatic, because strategically, from the point of view of future wars, Italy needed a military foothold on the other side of the Adriatic, but her people did not live there except in little spots. It was a Slavic people, and I had to say to my Italian friends, "Everywhere else in this treaty we have given territory to the people who lived on it, and I do not think that it is for the advantage of Italy, and I am sure it is not for the advantage of the world, to give Italy territory where other people live." I felt the force of the argument for what they wanted, and it was the old argument that had always prevailed, namely, that they needed it from a military point of view, and I have no doubt that if there is no League of Nations, they will need it from a military point of view; but if there is a League of Nations, they will not need it from a military point of view.

If there is no League of Nations, the military point of view will prevail in every instance, and peace will be brought into contempt, but if there is a League of Nations, Italy need not fear the fact that the shores on the other side of the Adriatic tower above the lower and sandy shores on her side of the sea, because there will be no threatening guns there, and the nations of the world will have concerted, not merely to see that the Slavic peoples have their rights, but that the Italian people have their rights as well. I had rather have everybody on my side than be armed to the teeth. Every settlement that is right, every settlement that

is based on the principles I have alluded to, is a safe settlement, because the sympathy of mankind will be behind it.

Some gentlemen have feared with regard to the League of Nations that we will be obliged to do things we do not want to do. If the treaty were wrong, that might be so, but if the treaty is right, we will wish to preserve right. I think I know the heart of this great people whom I, for the time being have the high honor to represent, better than some other men that I hear talk. I have been bred, and am proud to have been bred, in the old revolutionary school which set this Government up, when it was set up as the friend of mankind, and I know if they do not America has never lost that vision or that purpose. But I have not the slightest fear that arms will be necessary if the purpose is there. If I know that my adversary is armed and I am not, I do not press the controversy, and if any nation entertains selfish purposes set against the principles established in this treaty and is told by the rest of the world that it must withdraw its claims, it will not press them.

The heart of this treaty then, my fellow citizens, is not even that it punishes Germany. That is a temporary thing. It is that it rectifies the age-long wrongs which characterized the history of Europe. There were some of us who wished that the scope of the treaty would reach some other age-long wrongs. It was a big job, and I do not say that we wished that it were bigger, but there were other wrongs elsewhere than in Europe and of the same kind which no doubt ought to be righted, and some day will be righted, but which we could not draw into the treaty because we could deal only with the countries whom the war had engulfed and affected. But so far as our authority went, we rectified the wrongs which have been the fertile source of war in Europe.

Have you ever reflected, my fellow countrymen, on the real source of revolution? Men do not start revolutions in a sudden passion. Do you remember what Thomas Carlyle said about the French Revolution? He was speaking of the

so-called Hundred Days Terror which reigned not only in Paris, but throughout France, in the days of the French Revolution, and he reminded his readers that back of that hundred days lay several hundred years of agony and of wrong. The French people had been deeply and consistently wronged by their Government, robbed, their human rights disregarded, and the slow agony of those hundreds of years had after awhile gathered into a hot anger that could not be suppressed. Revolutions do not spring up overnight. Revolutions come from the long suppression of the human spirit. Revolutions come because men know that they have rights and that they are disregarded; and when we think of the future of the world in connection with this treaty we must remember that one of the chief efforts of those who made this treaty was to remove that anger from the heart of great peoples, great peoples who had always been suppressed, who had always been used, and who had always been the tools in the hands of governments, generally alien governments, not their own. The makers of the treaty knew that if these wrongs were not removed, there could be no peace in the world, because, after all, my fellow citizens, war comes from the seed of wrong and not from the seed of right. This treaty is an attempt to right the history of Europe, and, in my humble judgment, it is a measurable success. I say "measurable," my fellow citizens, because you will realize the difficulty of this:

Here are two neighboring peoples. The one people have not stopped at a sharp line, and the settlements of the other people or their migrations have not begun at a sharp line. They have intermingled. There are regions where you can not draw a national line and say there are Slavs on this side [illustrating] and Italians on that [illustrating]. It can not be done. You have to approximate the line. You have to come as near to it as you can, and then trust to the processes of history to redistribute, it may be, the people that are on the wrong side of the line. There are many such

lines drawn in this treaty and to be drawn in the Austrian treaty, where there are perhaps more lines of that sort than in the German treaty. When we came to draw the line between the Polish people and the German people—not the line between Germany and Poland; there was no Poland, strictly speaking, but the line between the German and the Polish people—we were confronted by such problems as the disposition of districts like the eastern part of Silesia, which is called Upper Silesia because it is mountainous and the other part is not. Upper Silesia is chiefly Polish, and when we came to draw the line of what should be Poland it was necessary to include Upper Silesia if we were really going to play fair and make Poland up of the Polish peoples wherever we found them in sufficiently close neighborhood to one another, but it was not perfectly clear that Upper Silesia wanted to be part of Poland. At any rate, there were Germans in Upper Silesia who said that it did not, and therefore we did there what we did in many other places. We said, "Very well, then, we will let the people that live there decide. We will have a referendum. Within a certain length of time after the war, under the supervision of an international commission which will have a sufficient armed force behind it to preserve order and see that nobody interferes with the elections, we will have an absolutely free vote and Upper Silesia shall go either to Germany or to Poland, as the people in Upper Silesia prefer." That illustrates many other cases where we provided for a referendum, or a plebiscite, as they chose to call it. We are going to leave it to the people themselves, as we should have done, what government they shall live under. It is none of my prerogative to allot peoples to this government or the other. It is nobody's right to do that allotting except the people themselves, and I want to testify that this treaty is shot through with the American principle of the choice of the governed.

Of course, at times it went further than we could make

a practical policy of, because various peoples were keen upon getting back portions of their population which were separated from them by many miles of territory, and we could not spot the map over with little pieces of separated States. I even reminded my Italian colleagues that if they were going to claim every place where there was a large Italian population, we would have to cede New York to them, because there are more Italians in New York than in any Italian city. But I hope, I believe, that the Italians in New York City are as glad to stay there as we are to have them. But I would not have you suppose that I am intimating that my Italian colleagues entered any claim for New York City.

We of all peoples in the world, my fellow citizens, ought to be able to understand the questions of this treaty without anybody explaining them to us, for we are made up out of all the peoples of the world. I dare say that in this audience there are representatives of practically all the peoples dealt with in this treaty. You do not have to have me explain national aspirations to you. You have been brought up on them. You have learned of them since you were children, and it is those national aspirations which we sought to release and give an outlet to in this great treaty.

But we did much more than that. This treaty contains among other things a Magna Charta of labour—a thing unheard of until this interesting year of grace. There is a whole section of the treaty devoted to arrangements by which the interests of those who labour with their hands all over the world, whether they be men or women or children, are sought to be safeguarded; and next month there is to meet the first assembly under this section of the League. Let me tell you, it will meet whether the treaty is ratified by that time or not. There is to meet an assembly which represents the interests of laboring men throughout the world. Not their political interests; there is nothing political about it. It is the interests of men concerning the con-

ditions of their labour; concerning the character of labour which women shall engage in, the character of labour which children shall be permitted to engage in; the hours of labour; and, incidentally, of course, the remuneration of labour; that labour shall be remunerated in proportion, of course, to the maintenance of the standard of living, which is proper, for the man who is expected to give his whole brain and intelligence and energy to a particular task. I hear very little said about the Magna Charta of labour which is embodied in this treaty. It forecasts the day, which ought to have come long ago, when statesmen will realize that no nation is fortunate which is not happy and that no nation can be happy whose people are not contented; contended in their lives and fortunate in the circumstances of their lives.

If I were to state what seems to me the central idea of this treaty, it would be this: It is almost a discovery in international conventions that nations do not consist of their governments but consist of their people. That is a rudimentary idea. It seems to us in America to go without saying, but, my fellow citizens, it was never the leading idea in any other international congress that I ever heard of; that is to say, any international congress made up of the representatives of governments. They were always thinking of national policy, of national advantage, of the rivalries of trade, of the advantages of territorial conquest. There is nothing of that in this treaty. You will notice that even the territories which are taken away from Germany, like her colonies, are not given to anybody. There is not a single act of annexation in this treaty. Territories inhabited by people not yet to govern themselves, either because of economical or other circumstances, are put under the care of powers, who are to act as trustees—trustees responsible in the form of the world at the bar of the League of Nations, and the terms upon which they are to exercise their trusteeship are outlined. They are not to use those people

by way of draft to fight their wars for them. They are not to permit any form of slavery among them, or of enforced labour. They are to see to it that there are humane conditions of labour with regard not only to the women and children but to the men also. They are to establish no fortifications. They are to regulate the liquor and the opium traffic. They are to see to it, in other words, that the lives of the people whose care they assume—not sovereignty over whom they assume—are kept clean and safe and wholesome. There again the principle of the treaty comes out, that the object of the arrangement is the welfare of the people who live there, and not the advantage of the trustee.

It goes beyond that. It seeks to gather under the common supervision of the League of Nations the various instrumentalities by which the world has been trying to check the evils that were in some places debasing men, like the opium traffic, like the traffic—for it was a traffic—in women and children, like the traffic in other dangerous drugs, like the traffic in arms among uncivilized people who could use arms only for their own detriment. It provides for sanitation, for the work of the Red Cross. Why, those clauses, my fellow citizens, draw the hearts of the world into league, draw the noble impulses of the world together and make a team of them.

I used to be told that this was an age in which mind was monarch, and my comment was that if that was true, the mind was one of those modern monarchs that reigns and does not govern; that, as a matter of fact, we were governed by a great representative assembly made up of the human passions, and that the best we could manage was that the high and fine passions should be in a majority so that they could control the baser passions, so that they could check the things that were wrong. This treaty seeks something like that. In drawing the humane endeavors of the world together it makes a league of the fine passions of the world, of its philanthropic passions, of its passion of pity, of its

passion of human sympathy, of its passion of human friendliness and helpfulness, for there is such a passion. It is the passion which has lifted us along the slow road of civilization. It is the passion which has made ordered government possible. It is the passion which has made justice and established it in the world.

That is the treaty. Did you ever hear of it before? Did you ever know before what was in this treaty? Did anybody before ever tell you what the treaty was intended to do? I beg, my fellow citizens, that you and the rest of those Americans with whom we are happy to be associated all over this broad land will read the treaty yourselves, or, if you will not take the time to do that—for it is a technical document—that you will accept the interpretation of those who made it and know what the intentions were in the making of it. I hear a great deal, my fellow citizens, about the selfishness and the selfish ambitions of other governments, and I would not be doing justice to the gifted men with whom I was associated on the other side of the water if I did not testify that the purposes that I have outlined were their purposes. We differed as to the method very often. We had discussions as to the details, but we never had any serious discussion as to the principle. While we all acknowledged that the principles might perhaps in detail have been better realized, we are all back of those principles. There is a concert of mind and of purpose and of policy in the world that was never in existence before. I am not saying that by way of credit to myself or to those colleagues to whom I have alluded, because what happened to us was that we got messages from our people. We were under instructions, whether they were written down or not, and we did not dare come home without fulfilling those instructions. If I could not have brought back the kind of treaty that I did bring back, I never would have come back, because I would have been an unfaithful servant, and you would have had the right to condemn me in any way that

chose to use. So that I testify that this is an American treaty not only, but it is a treaty that expresses the heart of the great peoples who were associated together in the war against Germany.

I said at the opening of this informal address, my fellow citizens, that I had come to make a report to you. I want to add to that a little bit. I have not come to debate the treaty. It speaks for itself, if you will let it. The arguments directed against it are directed against it with a radical misunderstanding of the instrument itself. Therefore, I am not going anywhere to debate the treaty. I am going to expound it, and I am going, as I do here, now, today, to urge you in every vocal method that you can use to assert the spirit of the American people in support of it. Do not let men pull it down. Do not let them misrepresent it. Do not let them lead this Nation away from the high purposes with which this war was inaugurated and fought. As I came through that line of youngsters in khaki a few minutes ago I felt that I could salute them because I had done the job in the way I promised them I would do it, and when this treaty is accepted, men in khaki will not have to cross the seas again. That is the reason I believe in it.

I say "when it is accepted," for it will be accepted. I have never entertained a moment's doubt of that, and the only thing I have been impatient of has been the delay. It is not dangerous delay, except for the temper of the peoples scattered throughout the world who are waiting. Do you realize, my fellow citizens, that the whole world is waiting on America? The only country in the world that is trusted at this moment is the United States, and the peoples of the world are waiting to see whether their trust is justified or not. That has been the ground of my impatience. I knew their trust was justified, but I begrudged the time that certain gentlemen wish to take in telling them so. We shall tell them so in a voice as authentic as any voice in history, and in the years to come men will be glad to remember that

they had some part in the great struggle which brought this incomparable consummation of the hopes of mankind.

I am trying to tell the people what is in the treaty. You would not know what was in it to read some of the speeches I read, and if you will be generous enough to me to read some of the things I say, I hope it will help to clarify a great many matters which have been very much obscured by some of the things which have been said. Because we have now to make the most critical choice we ever made as a nation, and it ought to be made in all soberness and without the slightest tinge of party feeling in it. I would be ashamed of myself if I discussed this great matter as a Democrat and not as an American. I am sure that every man who looks at it without party prejudice and as an American will find in that treaty more things that are genuinely American than were ever put into any similar document before.

The chief thing to notice about it, my fellow citizens, is that it is the first treaty ever made by great powers that was not made in their own favor. It is made for the protection of the weak peoples of the world and not for the aggrandizement of the strong. That is a noble achievement, and it is largely due to the influence of such great peoples as the people of America, who hold at their heart this principle, that nobody has the right to impose sovereignty upon anybody else; that, in disposing of the affairs of a nation, that nation or people must be its own master and make its own choice. The extraordinary achievement of this treaty is that it gives a free choice to people who never could have won it for themselves. It is for the first time in the history of international transactions an act of systematic justice and not an act of grabbing and seizing.

If you will just regard that as the heart of the treaty—for it is the heart of the treaty—then everything else about it is put in a different light. If we want to stand by that principle, then we can justify the history of America as

we can in no other way, for that is the history and principle of America. That is at the heart of it. I beg that, whenever you consider this great matter, you will look at it from this point of view: Shall we or shall we not sustain the first great act of international justice? The thing wears a very big aspect when you look at it that way, and all little matters seem to fall away and one seems ashamed to bring in special interests, particularly party interests. What difference does party make when mankind is involved? Parties are intended, if they are intended for any legitimate purpose, to serve mankind, and they are based upon legitimate differences of opinion, not as to whether mankind shall be served or not, but as to the way in which it shall be served; and, so far as those differences are legitimate differences, party lines are justified.

Address at Coliseum, Indianapolis, Ind. September 4, 1919

Governor Goodrich, My Fellow Citizens:

I want to recall to you for the purposes of this evening the circumstances of the war and the purposes for which our men spent their lives on the other side of the sea. You will remember that a prince of the House of Austria was slain in one of the cities of Serbia. Serbia was one of the little kingdoms of Europe. She had no strength which any of the great powers needed to fear, and as we see the war now, Germany and those who conspired with her made a pretext of that assassination in order to make unconscionable demands of the weak and helpless Kingdom of Serbia. Not with a view to bringing about an acquiescence in those demands, but with a view to bringing about a conflict in which other purposes quite separate from the purposes connected with those demands could be achieved. Just so soon as those demands were made on Serbia, the other Govern-

ments of Europe sent telegraphic messages to Berlin and Vienna asking that the matter be brought into conference, and the significant circumstance of the beginning of this war is that the Austrian and German Governments did not dare to discuss the demands of Serbia or the purposes which they had in view. It is universally admitted on the other side of the water that if they had ever gone into international conference on the Austrian demands, the war never would have been begun. There was an insistent demand from London, for example, by the British foreign minister that the cabinets of Europe should be allowed time to confer with the Governments at Vienna and Berlin, and the Governments at Vienna and Berlin did not dare to admit time for discussion.

I am recalling these circumstances, my fellow citizens, because I want to point out to you what apparently has escaped the attention of some of the critics of the League of Nations, that the heart of the League of Nations covenant does not lie in any of the portions which have been discussed in public debate. The great bulk of the provisions of that covenant contain these engagements and promises on the part of the states which undertake to become members of it: That in no circumstances will they go to war without first having done one or other of two things, without first either having submitted the question to arbitration, in which case they agree to abide by the results, or having submitted the question to discussion by the council of the League of Nations, in which case they will allow six months for the discussion and engage not to go to war until three months after the council has announced its opinion upon the subject under dispute. The heart of the covenant of the League is that the nations solemnly covenant not to go to war for nine months after a controversy becomes acute.

If there had been nine days of discussion, Germany would not have gone to war. If there had been nine days upon which to bring to bear the opinion of the world, the

judgment of mankind, upon the purposes of those Governments, they never would have dared to execute those purposes. So that what it is important for us to remember is that when we sent those boys in khaki across the sea we promised them, we promised the world, that we would not conclude this conflict with a mere treaty of peace. We entered into solemn engagements with all the nations with whom we associated ourselves that we would bring about such a kind of settlement and such a concert of the purpose of nations that wars like this could not occur again. If this war has to be fought over again, then all our high ideals and purposes have been disappointed, for we did not go into this war merely to beat Germany. We went into this war to beat all purposes such as Germany entertained.

You will remember how the conscience of mankind was shocked by what Germany did; not merely by the circumstance to which I have already adverted, that unconscionable demands were made upon a little nation which could not resist, but that immediately upon the beginning of the war the solemn engagements of treaty were cast on one side, and the chief representative of the Imperial Government of Germany said that when national purposes were under consideration treaties were mere scraps of paper, and immediately upon that declaration the German armies invaded the territories of Belgium which they had engaged should be inviolate, invaded those territories with the half-avowed purpose that Belgium was to be permanently retained by Germany in order that she should have the proper frontage on the sea and the proper advantage in her contest with the other nations of the world. The act which was characteristic of the beginning of this war was the violation of the territorial integrity of the Kingdom of Belgium.

We are presently, my fellow countrymen, to have the very great pleasure of welcoming on this side of the sea the King and the Queen of the Belgians, and I, for one, am perfectly sure that we are going to make it clear to

them that we have not forgotten the violation of Belgium, that we have not forgotten the intolerable wrongs which were put upon that suffering people. I have seen their devastated country. Where it was not actually laid in ruins, every factory was gutted of its contents. All the machinery by which it would be possible for men to go to work again was taken away, and those parts of the machinery that could not be taken away were destroyed by experts who knew how to destroy them. Belgium was a very successful competitor of Germany in some lines of manufacture, and the German armies went there to see to it that that competition was removed. Their purpose was to crush the independent action of that little kingdom, not merely to use it as a gateway through which to attack France. And when they got into France, they not only fought the armies of France, but they put the coal mines of France out of commission, so that it will be a decade or more before France can supply herself with coal from her accustomed sources. You have heard a great deal about Article X of the covenant of the League of Nations. Article X speaks the conscience of the world. Article X is the article which goes to the heart of this whole bad business, for that article says that the members of this League (that is intended to be all the great nations of the world) engage to respect and to preserve against all external aggression the territorial integrity and political independence of the nations concerned. That promise is necessary in order to prevent this sort of war from recurring, and we are absolutely discredited if we fought this war and then neglect the essential safeguard against it. You have heard it said, my fellow citizens, that we are robbed of some degree of our sovereign, independent choice by articles of that sort. Every man who makes a choice to respect the rights of his neighbors deprives himself of absolute sovereignty, but he does it by promising never to do wrong, and I can not for one see anything that robs me of any inherent right that I ought

to retain when I promise that I will do right, when I promise that I will respect the thing which, being disregarded and violated, brought on a war in which millions of men lost their lives, in which the civilization of mankind was in the balance, in which there was the most outrageous exhibition ever witnessed in the history of mankind of the rapacity and disregard for right of a great armed people.

We engage in the first sentence of Article X to respect and preserve from external aggression the territorial integrity and the existing political independence not only of the other member States, but of all States, and if any member of the League of Nations disregards that promise, then what happens? The council of the League advises what should be done to enforce the respect for that covenant on the part of the nation attempting to violate it, and there is no compulsion upon us to take that advice except the compulsion of our good conscience and judgment. It is perfectly evident that if, in the judgment of the people of the United States the council adjudged wrong and that this was not a case for the use of force, there would be no necessity on the part of the Congress of the United States to vote the use of force. But there could be no advice of the council on any such subject without a unanimous vote, and the unanimous vote includes our own, and if we accepted the advice we would be accepting our own advice. For I need not tell you that the representatives of the Government of the United States would not vote without instructions from their Government at home, and that what we united in advising we could be certain that the American people would desire to do. There is in that covenant not only not a surrender of the independent judgment of the Government of the United States, but an expression of it, because that independent judgment would have to join with the judgment of the rest.

But when is that judgment going to be expressed, my fellow citizens? Only after it is evident that every other

resource has failed, and I want to call your attention to the central machinery of the League of Nations. If any member of that League, or any nation not a member, refuses to submit the question at issue either to arbitration or to discussion by the council, there ensues automatically by the engagements of this covenant an absolute economic boycott. There will be no trade with that nation by any member of the League. There will be no interchange of communication by post or telegraph. There will be no travel to or from that nation. Its borders will be closed. No citizen of any other State will be allowed to enter it, and no one of its citizens will be allowed to leave it. It will be hermetically sealed by the united action of the most powerful nations in the world. And if this economic boycott bears with unequal weight, the members of the League agree to support one another and to relieve one another in any exceptional disadvantages that may arise out of it.

I want you to realize that this war was won not only by the armies of the world. It was won by economic means as well. Without the economic means the war would have been much longer continued. What happened was that Germany was shut off from the economic resources of the rest of the globe and she could not stand it. A nation that is boycotted is a nation that is in sight of surrender. Apply this economic, peaceful, silent, deadly remedy and there will be no need for force. It is a terrible remedy. It does not cost a life outside the nation boycotted, but it brings a pressure upon that nation which, in my judgment, no modern nation could resist.

This is the first treaty in the history of civilization in which great powers have associated themselves together in order to protect the weak. I need not tell you that I speak with knowledge in this matter, knowledge of the purpose of the men with whom the American delegates were associated at the peace table. They came there, every one that I consulted with, with the same idea, that wars had arisen

in the past because the strong took advantage of the weak, and that the only way to stop wars was to bind ourselves together to protect the weak; that the example of this war was the example which gave us the finger to point the way of escape: That as Austria and Germany had tried to put upon Serbia, so we must see to it that Serbia and the Slavic peoples associated with her, and the peoples of Roumania, and the people of Bohemia, and the peoples of Hungary and Austria for that matter, should feel assured in the future that the strength of the great powers was behind their liberty and their independence and was not intended to be used, and never should be used, for aggression against them.

So when you read the covenant, read the treaty with it. I have no doubt that in this audience there are many men which come from that ancient stock of Poland, for example, men in whose blood there is the warmth of old affections connected with that betrayed and ruined country, men whose memories run back to intolerable wrongs suffered by those they love in that country, and I call them to witness that Poland never could have won unity and independence for herself, and those gentlemen sitting at Paris presented Poland with a unity which she could not have won and an independence which she can not defend unless the world guarantees it to her. There is one of the most noble chapters in the history of the world, that this war was concluded in order to remedy the wrongs which had bitten so deep into the experience of the weaker peoples of that great continent. The object of the war was to see to it that there was no more of that sort of wrong done. Now, when you have that picture in your mind, that this treaty was meant to protect those who could not protect themselves, turn the picture and look at it this way:

Those very weak nations are situated through the very tract of country—between Germany and Persia—which Germany had meant to conquer and dominate, and if the

nations of the world do not maintain their concert to sustain the independence and freedom of those peoples, Germany will yet have her will upon them, and we shall witness the very interesting spectacle of having spent millions upon millions of American treasure and, what is much more precious, hundreds of thousands of American lives, to do a futile thing, to do a thing which we will then leave to be undone at the leisure of those who are masters of intrigue, at the leisure of those who are masters in combining wrong influences to overcome right influences, of those who are the masters of the very things that we hate and mean always to fight. For, my fellow citizens, if Germany should ever attempt that again, whether we are in the League of Nations or not, we will join to prevent it. We do not stand off and see murder done. We do not profess to be the champions of liberty and then consent to see liberty destroyed. We are not the friends and advocates of free government and then willing to stand by and see free government die before our eyes. If a power such as Germany was, but thank God no longer is, were to do this thing upon the fields of Europe, then America would have to look to it that she did not do it also upon the fields of the Western Hemisphere, and we should at last be face to face with a power which at the outset we could have crushed, and which now it is within our choice to keep within the harness of civilization.

I am discussing this thing with you, my fellow citizens, as if I had a doubt of what the verdict of the American people would be. I have not the slightest doubt. I just wanted to have the pleasure of pointing out to you how absolutely ignorant of the treaty and of the covenant some of the men are who have been opposing them. If they do read the English language, they do not understand the English language as I understand it. If they have really read this treaty and this covenant they only amaze me by their inability to understand what is plainly expressed. My

errand upon this journey is not to argue these matters, but to recall you to the real issues which are involved. And one of the things that I have most at heart in this report to my fellow citizens is that they should forget what party I belong to and what party they belong to. I am making this journey as a democrat, but I am spelling it with a little "d," and I do not want anybody to remember, so far as this errand is concerned, that it is ever spelt with a big D. I am making this journey as an American and as a champion of rights which America believes in; and I need not tell you that as compared with the importance of America the importance of the Democratic Party and the importance of the Republican Party and the importance of every other party is absolutely negligible. Parties, my fellow citizens, are intended to embody in action different policies of government. They are not, when properly used, intended to traverse the principles which underlie government, and the principles which underlie the Government of the United States have been familiar to us ever since we were children. You have been bred, I have no doubt, as I have been bred, in the revolutionary school of American thought. I mean that school of American thought which takes its inspiration from the days of the American Revolution. There were only three million of us then, but we were ready to stand out against the world for liberty. There are more than a hundred million of us now, and we are ready to insist that everywhere men shall be champions of liberty.

I want you to notice another interesting point that is never dilated upon in connection with the League of Nations. I am treading now upon delicate ground and I must express myself with caution. There were a good many delegations that visited Paris who wanted to be heard by the peace conference who had real causes to present which ought to be presented to the view of the world, but we had to point out to them that they did not happen, unfortunately, to come within the area of settle-

ment, that their questions were not questions which were necessarily drawn into the things that we were deciding. We were sitting there with the pieces of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in our hands. It had fallen apart. It never was naturally cohesive. We were sitting there with various dispersed assets of the German Empire in our hands, and with regard to every one of them we had to determine what we were going to do with them, but we did not have our own dispersed assets in our hands. We did not have the assets of the nations which constitute the body of nations associated against Germany to dispose of, and therefore we had often, with whatever regret, to turn away from questions that ought some day to be discussed and settled and upon which the opinion of the world ought to be brought to bear.

Therefore, I want to call your attention, if you will turn to it when you go home, to Article XI, following Article X, of the covenant of the League of Nations. That article, let me say, is the favorite article in the treaty, so far as I am concerned. It says that every matter which is likely to affect the peace of the world is everybody's business; that it shall be the friendly right of any nation to call attention in the League to anything that is likely to affect the peace of the world or the good understanding between nations, upon which the peace of the world depends, whether that matter immediately concerns the nation drawing attention to it or not. In other words, at present we have to mind our own business. Under the covenant of the League of Nations we can mind other peoples' business, and anything that affects the peace of the world, whether we are parties to it or not, can by our delegates be brought to the attention of mankind. We can force a nation on the other side of the globe to bring to that bar of mankind any wrong that is afoot in that part of the world which is likely to affect good understanding between nations, and we can oblige them to show cause why it should not be remedied.

There is not an oppressed people in the world which can not henceforth get a hearing at that forum, and you know, my fellow citizens, what a hearing will mean if the cause of those people is just. The one thing that those who are doing injustice have most reason to dread is publicity and discussion, because if you are challenged to give a reason why you are doing a wrong thing it has to be an exceedingly good reason, and if you give a bad reason you confess judgment and the opinion of mankind goes against you.

At present what is the state of international law and understanding? No nation has the right to call attention to anything that does not directly affect its own affairs. If it does, it can not only be told to mind its own business, but it risks the cordial relationship between itself and the nation whose affairs it draws under discussion; whereas, under Article XI the very sensible provision is made that the peace of the world transcends all the susceptibilities of nations and governments, and that they are obliged to consent to discuss and explain anything which does affect the understanding between nations.

Not only that, but there is another thing in this covenant which cures one of the principal difficulties we encountered at Paris. I need not tell you that at every turn in those discussions we came across some secret treaty, some understanding that had never been made public before, some understanding which embarrassed the whole settlement. I think it will not be improper for me to refer to one of them. When we came to the settlement of the Shantung matter with regard to China, we found that Great Britain and France were under explicit treaty obligation to Japan that she should get exactly what she got in the treaty with Germany, and the most that the United States could do was to urge upon Japan the promise, which she gave, that she would not take advantage of those portions of the treaty but would return to the Republic of China, without qualification, the sovereignty which Germany had enjoyed in

Shantung Province. We have had repeated assurances since then that Japan means to fulfill those promises in absolute good faith. But my present point is that there stood at the very gate of that settlement a secret treaty between Japan and two of the great powers engaged in this war on our side. We could not ask them to disregard those promises. This war had been fought in part because of the refusal to observe the fidelity which is involved in a promise, because of the failure to regard the sacredness of treaties, and this covenant of the League of Nations provides that no secret treaty shall have any validity. It provides in explicit terms that every treaty, every international understanding, shall be registered with the secretary of the League, that it shall be published as soon as possible after it is there registered, and that no treaty that is not there registered will be regarded by any of the nations engaged in the covenant. So that we not only have the right to discuss anything, but we make everything open for discussion. If this covenant accomplished little more than the abolition of private arrangements between great powers, it would have gone far toward stabilizing the peace of the world and securing justice, which it has been so difficult to secure so long as nations could come to secret understandings with one another.

ADDRESS AT LUNCHEON AT HOTEL STATLER, ST. LOUIS, MO.

SEPTEMBER 5, 1919

Mr. Johnson, Your Honor Mr. Mayor, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is with great pleasure that I find myself in St. Louis again, because I have always found it possible in St. Louis to discuss serious questions in a way that gets mind in contact with mind, instead of that other less desirable thing, passion in contact with passion. I am glad to hear the

mayor say, and I believe that it is true, that politics is adjourned. Party politics has no place, my fellow citizens, in the subject we are now obliged to discuss and to decide. Politics in the wider sense has a great deal to do with it. The politics of the world, the policy of mankind, the concert of the methods by which the world is to be bettered, that concert of will and of action which will make every nation a nobler instrument of Divine Providence—that is world politics.

I have sometimes heard gentlemen discussing the questions that are now before us with a distinction drawn between nationalism and internationalism in these matters. It is very difficult for me to follow their distinction. The greatest nationalist is the man who wants his nation to be the greatest nation, and the greatest nation is the nation which penetrates to the heart of its duty and mission among the nations of the world. With every flash of insight into the great politics of mankind, the nation that has that vision is elevated to a place of influence and power which it can not get by arms, which it can not get by commercial rivalry, which it can get by no other way than by that spiritual leadership which comes from a profound understanding of the problems of humanity. It is in the light of ideas of this sort that I conceive it a privilege to discuss the matters that I have come away from Washington to discuss.

I have come away from Washington to discuss them because apparently it is difficult to discuss them in Washington. The whole subject is surrounded with a mist which it is difficult to penetrate. I brought home with me from the other side of the water a great document, a great human document, but after you hear it talked about in Washington for awhile you think that it has just about three or four clauses in it. You fancy that it has a certain Article X in it, that it has something about Shantung in it, that it has something about the Monroe Doctrine in it, that it has something about

quitting, withdrawing from the League, showing that you do not want to play the game. I do not hear about anything else in it. Why, my fellow citizens, those are mere details and incidents of a great human enterprise, and I have sought the privilege of telling you what I conceive that human enterprise to be.

The war that has just been finished was no accident. Any man who had followed the politics of the world up to that critical break must have known that that was the logical outcome of the processes that had preceded it, must have known that the nations of the world were preparing for that very thing and were expecting it. One of the most interesting things that I realized after I got to the other side of the water was that the mental attitude of the French people with regard to the settlement of this war was largely determined by the fact that for nearly 50 years they had expected it, that for nearly 50 years they had dreaded, by the exercise of German force, the very thing that had happened, and their constant theme was, "We must devise means by which this intolerable fear will be lifted from our hearts. We can not, we will not, live another 50 years under the cloud of that terror." The terror had been there all the time and the war was its flame and consummation. It had been expected, because the politics of Europe were based upon a definite conception. That conception was that the strong had all the rights and that all that the weak could enjoy was what the strong permitted them to enjoy; that no nation had any right that could not be asserted by the exercise of force, and that the real politics of Europe consisted in determining how many of the weak elements in the European combination of families and of nations should be under the influence and control of one set of nations and how many of those elements should be under the influence and control of another set of nations.

One of the centers of all the bad business was in that town of Constantinople. I do not suppose that intrigue was

ever anywhere else reduced to such a consummate art or practiced with such ardor and subtlety as in Constantinople. That was because Constantinople was the key to the weak part of Europe. That was where the pawns were, not the kings and the queens and the castles and the bishops and the rest of the chess game of politics, but the little pawns. They made the openings for the heavier pieces. Their maneuvers determined the arrangement of the board, and those who controlled the pawns controlled the outcome of the whole effort to checkmate and to match and to capture and to take advantage. The shrewdest politicians in the diplomatic service of the several nations were put at Constantinople to run the game, which consisted in maneuvering the weak for the advantage of the strong, and every international conference that preceded the conference at Paris, which is still in process, was intended to complete and consummate the arrangements for that game. For the first time in the history of mankind, the recent conference at Paris was convened to destroy that system and substitute another.

I take it, my fellow citizens, that when you look at that volume, for it is a thick volume, that contains the treaty of peace with Germany, in the light of what I have been saying to you, you will read it with greater interest than you have hitherto attached to it. It is the chart and constitution of a new system for the world, and that new system is based upon an absolute reversal of the principles of the old system. The central object of that treaty is to establish the independence and protect the integrity of the weak peoples of the world. I hear some gentlemen, who are themselves incapable of altruistic purposes, say, "Ah, but that is altruistic. It is not our business to take care of the weak nations of the world." No, but it is our business to prevent war, and if we do not take care of the weak nations of the world, there will be war. These gentlemen assume the rôle of being very practical men, and they say, "We do not

want to get into war to protect every little nation in the world." Very well then, let them show me how they will keep out of war by not protecting them, and let them show me how they will prove that, having gone into an enterprise, they are not absolute, contemptible quitters if they do not see the game through. They joined with the rest of us in the profession of fine purpose when we went into the war, and what was the fine purpose that they professed? It was not merely to defeat Germany. It is not a handsome enterprise for any great nation to go into a war merely to reduce another nation to obedience. They went in, and they professed to go in, to see to it that nobody after Germany's defeat should repeat the experiment which Germany had tried. And how do they propose to do that? To leave the material that Germany was going to make her dominating empire out of helpless and at her mercy.

What was the old formula of Pan-Germanism? From Bremen to Bagdad, wasn't it? Well, look at the map. What lies between Bremen and Bagdad? After you get past the German territory, there is Poland. There is Bohemia, which we have made into Czecho-Slovakia. There is Hungary, which is divided from Austria and does not share Austria's strength. There is Roumania. There is Jugo-Slavia. There is broken Turkey; and then Persia and Bagdad. The route is open. The route is wide open, and we have undertaken to say, "This route is closed!" If you do not close it, you have no choice but some day or other to enter into exactly the same sort of war that we have just gone through. Those gentlemen are dreaming. They are living in a past age which is gone and all but forgotten when they say that we can mind our own business.

What is our own business? Is there any merchant present here or any manufacturer or any banker who can say that our interests are separate from the interest of the rest of the world, commercially, industrially, financially? There is not a man in any one of those professions who does not

admit that our industrial fortunes are tied up with the industrial fortunes of the rest of the world. He knows that, and when he draws a picture to himself, if he is frank, of what some gentlemen propose, this is what he sees: America minding her own business and having no other—despised, suspected, distrusted; and on the other side of the water the treaty and its operation—interrupted? Not at all! We are a great nation, my fellow citizens, but the treaty is going to be applied just the same whether we take part in it or not, and part of its application, at the center of its application, stands that great problem of the rehabilitation of Germany industrially. I say the problem of her rehabilitation because unless she is rehabilitated she can not pay the reparation. The reparation commission created by the treaty is created for the purpose of seeing that Germany pays the reparation, and it was admitted in all our conferences that in order to do that steps must be taken to enable Germany to pay the reparation, which means her industrial and commercial rehabilitation. Not only that, but some of you gentlemen know we used to have a trade with Germany. All of that trade is going to be in the hands and under the control of the reparation commission. I humbly asked leave to appoint a member to look after our interests, and I was rebuked for it. I am looking after the industrial interest of the United States. I would like to see the other men who are. They are forgetting the industrial interests of the United States, and they are doing things that will cut us off, and our trade off, from the normal channels, because the reparation commission can determine where Germany buys, what Germany buys, how much Germany buys; the reparation commission can determine in what instruments of credit she temporarily expresses her debt. It can determine how those instruments of credit shall be used for the basis of the credit which must underlie international exchanges. It is going to stand at the center of the financial operations of the world. Now, is it minding

our business to keep out of that? On the contrary, it is handing our business over to people who are not particularly interested in seeing that it prospers. These are facts which I can appropriately address to a chamber of commerce because they are facts which nobody can controvert and which yet seem often to be forgotten. The broad aspects of this subject are seldom brought to your attention. It is the little picayune details here and there.

That brings me, my fellow citizens, to the guarantee of this whole thing. We said that we were going to fight this war for the purpose of seeing to it that the mothers and sisters and fathers of this land, and the sweethearts and wives, did not have to send their lads over on the other side of the sea to fight any more, and so we took part in an arrangement by which justice was to be secured throughout the world. The rest of the world, partly at our suggestion, said "Yes," and said it gladly; said "Yes, we will go into the partnership to see that justice is maintained;" and then I come home and hear some gentlemen say, "But will we?" Are we interested in justice? The treaty of peace, as I have just said to you, is based upon the protection of the weak against the strong, and there is only one force that can protect the weak against the strong, and that is the universal concert of the strength of mankind. That is the League of Nations.

But I beg that you will not conceive of the League of Nations as a combination of the world for war, for that is exactly what it is not. It is a combination of the world for arbitration and discussion. I was taking the pains the other day to make a sort of table of contents of the covenant of the League of Nations, and I found that two-thirds of its provisions were devoted to setting up a system of arbitration and discussion in the world. Why, these are the facts, my fellow citizens: The members of the League agree that no one of them will ever go to war about anything without first doing one or other of two things: without either sub-

mitting the question to arbitration, in which case they agree to abide by the decision of the arbitrators absolutely, or submitting it to discussion by the council of the League of Nations, in which case they agree that, no matter what the opinion expressed by the council may be, they will allow six months for the discussion, and, whether they are satisfied with the conclusion or not, will not go to war in less than three months after the rendering of the opinion. I think we can take it for granted that the preliminaries would take two or three months, in which case you have a whole year of discussion even when you do not get arbitration; and I want to call you to witness that in almost every international controversy which has been submitted to thorough canvass by the opinion of the world it has become impossible for the result to be war. War is a process of heat. Exposure is a process of cooling; and what is proposed in this is that every hot thing shall be spread out in the cooling air of the opinion of the world, and after it is thoroughly cooled off, then let the nations concerned determine whether they are going to fight about it or not.

And notice the sanction. Any member of the League which breaks these promises with regard to arbitration or discussion is to be deemed thereby to have committed an act of war against the other members of the League; not merely to have done an immoral thing, but by refusing to obey those processes to have committed an act of war and put itself out of court. You know what then happens. You say, "Yes, we form an army and go and fight them." Not at all. We shut their doors and lock them in. We boycott them. Just so soon as that is done they can not ship cargoes out or receive them shipped in. They can not send a telegraphic message. They can not send or receive a letter. Nobody can leave their territory and nobody can enter their territory. They are absolutely boycotted by the rest of mankind. I do not think that after that remedy it will be necessary to do any fighting at all. What brought Germany

to her knees was, not only the splendid fighting of the incomparable men who met her armies, but that her doors were locked and she could not get supplies from any part of the world. There were a few doors open, doors to some Swedish ore, for example, that she needed for making munitions, and that kept her going for a time; but the Swedish door would be shut this time. There would not be any door open, and that brings a nation to its senses just as suffocation removes from the individual all inclination to fight.

That is the League of Nations, an agreement to arbitrate or discuss, and an agreement that if you do not arbitrate or discuss, you shall be absolutely boycotted and starved out. There is hardly a European nation, my fellow citizens, that is of a fighting inclination which has enough food to eat without importing food, and it will be a very persuasive argument that it has nothing to eat, because you can not fight on an empty stomach any more than you can worship God on an empty stomach.

When we add to that some other very interesting particulars, I think the League of Nations becomes a very interesting thing indeed. You have heard of Article X, and I am going to speak about that in a minute, but read Article XI, because, really, there are other articles in the covenant! Article XI says—I am not quoting its language, but its substance—that anything that is likely to affect the peace of the world or the good understanding upon which the peace of the world depends shall be everybody's business; that any nation, the littlest nation at the table, can stand up and challenge the right of the strongest nation there to keep on in a course of action or policy which is likely to disturb the peace of the world, and that it shall be its "friendly right" to do so. Those are the words. It can not be regarded as an hostile or unfriendly act. It is its friendly right to do that, and if you will not give the secret away, I wrote those words myself. I wanted it to be our friendly right and everybody's friendly right to dis-

cuss everything that was likely to affect the peace of the world, because that is everybody's business. It is everybody's business to see that nothing happens that does disturb the peace of the world.

And there is added to this particular this very interesting thing: There can hereafter be no secret treaties. There were nations represented around that board—I mean the board at which the commission on the League of Nations sat, where 14 nations were represented—there were nations represented around that board who had entered into many a secret treaty and understanding, and they made not the least objection to promising that hereafter no secret treaty should have any validity whatever. The provision of the covenant is that every treaty or international understanding shall be "registered," I believe the word is, with the general secretary of the League, that the general secretary shall publish it in full just so soon as it is possible for him to publish it, and that no treaty shall be valid which is not thus registered. It is like our arrangements with regard to mortgages on real estate, that until they are registered nobody else need pay any attention to them. So with the treaties: Until they are registered in this office of the League, nobody, not even the parties themselves, can insist upon their execution. You have cleared the deck thereby of the most dangerous thing and the most embarrassing thing that has hitherto existed in international politics.

It was very embarrassing, my fellow citizens, when you thought you were approaching an ideal solution of a particular question to find that some of your principal colleagues had given the whole thing away. And that leads me to speak just in passing of what has given a great many people natural distress. I mean the Shantung settlement, the settlement with regard to a portion of the Province of Shantung in China. Great Britain and, subsequently, France, as everybody now knows, in order to make it more certain that Japan would come into the war and so assist

to clear the Pacific of the German fleets, had promised that any rights that Germany had in China should, in the case of the victory of the Allies, pass to Japan. There was no qualification in the promise. She was to get exactly what Germany had, and so the only thing that was possible was to induce Japan to promise—and I want to say in fairness, for it would not be fair if I did not say it, that Japan did very handsomely make the promise which was requested of her—that she would retain in Shantung none of the sovereign rights which Germany had enjoyed there, but would return the sovereignty without qualification to China and retain in Shantung Province only what other nationalities had already had elsewhere, economic rights with regard to the development and administration of the railway and of certain mines which had become attached to the railway. That is her promise, and personally I have not the slightest doubt that she will fulfill that promise. She can not fulfill it right now because the thing does not go into operation until three months after the treaty is ratified, so that we must not be too impatient about it. But she will fulfill that promise.

Suppose that we said that we would not assent. England and France must assent, and if we are going to get Shantung Province back for China and these gentlemen do not want to engage in foreign wars, how are they going to get it back? Their idea of not getting into trouble seems to be to stand for the largest possible number of unworkable propositions. It is all very well to talk about standing by China, but how are you standing by China when you withdraw from the only arrangement by which China can be assisted? If you are China's friend, then do not go into the council where you can act as China's friend! If you are China's friend, then put her in a position where even the concessions which have been made need not be carried out! If you are China's friend, scuttle and run! That is not the kind of American I am.

Now, just a word about Article X. Permit me, if you will, to recur to what I said at the opening of these somewhat disjointed remarks. I said that the treaty was intended to destroy one system and substitute another. That other system was based upon the principle that no strong power need respect the territorial integrity or the political independence of any weak power. I need not confine the phraseology to that. It was based upon the principle that no power is obliged to respect the territorial integrity or the political independence of any other power if it has the force necessary to disregard it. So that Article X cuts at the very heart, and is the only instrument that will cut to the very heart, of the old system. Remember that if this covenant is adopted by the number of nations which it probably will be adopted by, it means that every nation except Germany and Turkey, because we have already said we would let Austria come in (Germany has to undergo a certain period of probation to see whether she has really experienced a change of heart and effected a genuine change of constitutional provision)—it means that all the nations of the world, except one strong and one negligible one, agree that they will respect and preserve against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of the other nations of the world. You would think from some of the discussions that the emphasis is on the word "preserve."

We are partners with the rest of the world in respecting the territorial integrity and political independence of others. They are all under solemn bonds themselves to respect and to preserve those things, and if they do not preserve them, if they do not respect them or preserve them, what happens? The council of the League then advises the several members of the League what it is necessary to do. I can testify from having sat at the board where the instrument was drawn that advice means advice. I supposed it did before I returned home, but I found some gentlemen doubted it. Advice means advice, and the advice can not be

given without the concurrent vote of the representatives of the United States. "Ah," but somebody says, "suppose we are a party to the quarrel!" I can not suppose that, because I know that the United States is not going to disregard the territorial integrity or the political independence of any other nation, but for the sake of the argument suppose that we are a party. Very well then, the scrap is ours anyway. For what these gentlemen are afraid of is that we are going to get into trouble. If we are a party, we are in trouble already, and if we are not a party, we can control the advice of the council by our vote. To my mind, that is a little like an open and shut game! I am not afraid of advice which we give ourselves; and yet that is the whole of the bugaboo which these gentlemen have been parading before you.

The solemn thing about Article X is the first sentence, not the second sentence. The first sentence says that we will respect and preserve against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of other nations; and let me stop a moment on the words "external aggression." Why were they put in? Because every man who sat at that board held that the right of revolution was sacred and must not be interfered with. Any kind of a row can happen inside and it is nobody's right to interfere. The only thing that there is any right to object to or interfere with is external aggression, by some outside power undertaking to take a piece of territory or to interfere with the internal political arrangements of the country which is suffering from the aggression; because territorial integrity does not mean that you can not invade another country; it means that you can not invade it and stay there. I have not impaired the territorial integrity of your backyard if I walk into it, but I very much impair it if I insist upon staying there and will not get out, and the impairment of integrity contemplated in this article is the kind of impairment as the seizure of territory, as an attempt at annexation, as an attempt at continuing domina-

tion either of the territory itself or of the methods of government inside that territory.

When you read Article X, therefore, you will see that it is nothing but the inevitable, logical center of the whole system of the covenant of the League of Nations, and I stand for it absolutely. If it should ever in any important respect be impaired, I would feel like asking the Secretary of War to get the boys who went across the water to fight together on some field where I could go and see them, and I would stand up before them and say, "Boys, I told you before you went across the seas that this was a war against wars, and I did my best to fulfill the promise, but I am obliged to come to you in mortification and shame and say I have not been able to fulfill the promise. You are betrayed. You fought for something that you did not get." And the glory of the armies and the navies of the United States is gone like a dream in the night, and there ensues upon it, in the suitable darkness of the night, the nightmare of dread which lay upon the nations before this war came; and there will come sometime, in the vengeful Providence of God, another struggle in which, not a few hundred thousand fine men from America will have to die, but as many millions as are necessary to accomplish the final freedom of the peoples of the world.

Address at Coliseum, St. Louis, Mo.
September 5, 1919

Mr. Chairman, Governor Gardner, My Fellow Countrymen:

I have come here tonight to ask permission to discuss with you some of the very curious aberrations of thinking that have taken place in this country of late. I have sought —I think I have sought without prejudice—to understand the point of view of the men who have been opposing the treaty and the covenant of the League of Nations. Many of

them are men whose judgment and whose patriotic feeling I have been accustomed to admire and respect, and yet I must admit to you, my fellow countrymen, that it is very hard for me to believe that they have followed their line of thinking to its logical and necessary conclusion, because when you reflect upon their position, it is either that we ought to reject this treaty altogether or that we ought to change it in such a way as will make it necessary to reopen negotiations with Germany and reconsider the settlements of the peace in many essential particulars. We can not do the latter alone, and other nations will not join us in doing it. The only alternative is to reject the peace and to do what some of our fellow countrymen have been advising us to do, stand alone in the world.

I am going to take the liberty tonight of pointing out to you what this alternative means. I know the course of reasoning which is either uttered or implicit in this advice when it is given us by some of the men who propose this course. They believe that the United States is so strong, so financially strong, so industrially strong, if necessary so physically strong, that it can impose its will upon the world if it is necessary for it to stand out against the world, and they believe that the processes of peace can be processes of domination and antagonism, instead of processes of co-operation and good feeling, I therefore want to point out to you that only those who are ignorant of the world can believe that any nation, even so great a nation as the United States, can stand alone and play a single part in the history of mankind.

Begin with a single circumstance; for I have not come here tonight to indulge in any kind of oratory. I have come here tonight to present to you certain hard facts which I want you to take home with you and think about. I suppose that most of you realize that it is going to be very difficult for the other nations that were engaged in this war to get financially on their feet again. I dare say

you read the other day the statement of Mr. Herbert Hoover's opinion, an opinion which I always greatly respect, that it will be necessary for the United States immediately to advance four or five billion dollars for the rehabilitation of credit and industry on the other side of the water, and I must say to you that I learned nothing in Paris which would lead me to doubt that conclusion. I think the statement of the sum is a reasonable and conservative statement. If the world is going bankrupt, if credit is going to be destroyed, if the industry of the rest of the world is going to be interrupted, our market is confined to the United States. Trade will be impossible, except within our own borders. If we are to save our own markets and rehabilitate our own industries, we must save the financial situation of the world and rehabilitate the markets of the world. Very well, what do these gentlemen propose? That we should do that, for we can not escape doing it.

Face to face with a situation of this kind, we are not, let us assume, partners in the execution of this treaty. What is one of the central features of the execution of this treaty? It is the application of the reparation clauses. Germany can not pay for this war unless her industries are revived, and the treaty of peace sets up a great commission known as the Reparation Commission, in which it was intended that there should be a member from the United States as well as from other countries. The business of this commission will be in part to see that the industries of Germany are revived in order that Germany may pay this great debt which she owes to civilization. That Reparation Commission can determine the currents of trade, the conditions of international credit; it can determine how much Germany is going to buy, where it is going to buy, how it is going to pay for it, and if we must, to save ourselves, contribute to the financial rehabilitation of the world, then without being members of this partnership we must put our money in the hands of those who want to get the

markets that belong to us. That is what these gentlemen call playing a lone hand. It is indeed playing a lone hand. It is playing a hand that is frozen out! We must contribute the money which other nations are to use in order to rehabilitate their industry and credit, and we must make them our antagonists and rivals and not our partners! I put that proposition to any business man, young or old, in the United States and ask him how he likes it, and whether he considers that a useful way for the United States to stand alone. We have got to carry this burden of reconstitution whether we will or not or be ruined, and the question is, Shall we carry it and be ruined anyhow? For that is what these gentlemen propose, that at every point we shall be embarrassed by the whole financial affairs of the world being in the hands of other nations.

The real reason that the war that we have just finished took place was that Germany was afraid her commercial rivals were going to get the better of her, and the reason why some nations went into the war against Germany was that they thought Germany would get the commercial advantage of them. The seed of the jealousy, the seed of the deep-seated hatred was hot, successful commercial and industrial rivalry.

Why, what did the Germans do when they got into Belgium? I have just seen that suffering country. Most of the Belgian factories are standing. You do not witness in Belgium what you witnessed in France, except upon certain battlefields—factories destroyed, whole towns wiped out. No; the factories are there, the streets are clear, the people are there, but go in the factories. Every piece of machinery that could be taken away has been taken away. If it was too big to take away, experts directed the way in which it should be injured so it could never be used again, and that was because there were textile industries and iron industries in Belgium which the Germans hated Belgium for having, because they were better than the German and

outdid them in the markets of the world. This war, in its inception was a commercial and industrial war. It was not a political war.

Very well, then, if we must stand apart and be the hostile rivals of the rest of the world, then we must do something else. We must be physically ready for anything that comes. We must have a great standing army. We must see to it that every man in America is trained to arms. We must see to it that there are munitions and guns enough for an army that means a mobilized nation; that they are not only laid up in store, but that they are kept up to date; that they are ready to use to-morrow; that we are a nation in arms; because you can not be unfriendly to everybody without being ready that everybody shall be unfriendly to you. And what does that mean? Reduction of taxes? No. Not only the continuation of the present taxes but the increase of the present taxes; and it means something very much more serious than that. We can stand that, so far as the expense is concerned, if we care to keep up the high cost of living and enjoy the other luxuries that we have recently enjoyed, but, what is much more seriòus than that, we have got to have the sort of organization which is the only kind of organization that can handle arms of that sort. We may say what we please of the German Government that has been destroyed, my fellow citizens, but it was the only sort of government that could handle an armed nation. You can not handle an armed nation by vote. You can not handle an armed nation if it is democratic, because democracies do not go to war that way. You have got to have a concentrated, militaristic organization of government to run a nation of that sort. You have got to think of the President of the United States, not as the chief counselor of the nation, elected for a little while, but as the man meant constantly and every day to be the Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, ready to order them to any part of the world where the threat

of war is a menace to his own people. And you can not do that under free debate. You can not do that under public counsel. Plans must be kept secret. Knowledge must be accumulated by a system which we have condemned, because we have called it a spying system. The more polite call it a system of intelligence. You can not watch other nations with your unassisted eye. You have got to watch them by secret agencies planted everywhere. Let me testify to this, my fellow citizens: I not only did not know it until we got into this war, but I did not believe it when I was told that it was true, that Germany was not the only country that maintained a secret service. Every country in Europe maintained it, because they had to be ready for Germany's spring upon them, and the only difference between the German secret service and the other secret services was that the German secret service found out more than the others did, and therefore Germany sprang upon the other nations unawares, and they were not ready for it.

And you know what the effect of a military government is upon social questions. You know how impossible it is to effect social reform if everybody must be under orders from the Government. You know how impossible it is, in short, to have a free nation, if it is a military nation and under military order. You may say, "You have been on the other side of the water and got bad dreams." I have got no dreams at all. I am telling you the things, the evidence of which I have seen with awakened eyes and not with sleeping eyes, and I know that this country, if it wishes to stand alone, must stand alone as part of a world in arms. Because, ladies and gentlemen—I do not say it because I am an American and my heart is full of the same pride that fills yours with regard to the power and spirit of this great nation, but merely because it is a fact which I think everybody would admit, outside of America, as well as inside of America—the organization contemplated by the

League of Nations without the United States would merely be an alliance and not a League of Nations. It would be an alliance in which the partnership would be between the more powerful European nations and Japan, and the other party to the world arrangement, the antagonist, the dis-associated party, the party standing off to be watched by the alliance, would be the United States of America. There can be no League of Nations in the true sense without the partnership of this great people.

Now, let us mix the selfish with the unselfish. If you do not want me to be too altruistic, let me be very practical. If we are partners, let me predict we will be the senior partner. The financial leadership will be ours. The industrial primacy will be ours. The commercial advantage will be ours. The other countries of the world are looking to us for leadership and direction. Very well, then, if I am to compete with the critics of this League and of this treaty as a selfish American, I say I want to get in and get in as quick as I can. I want to be inside and know how the thing is run and help to run it. You have the alternative, armed isolation or peaceful partnership. Can any sane man hesitate as to the choice, and can any sane man ask the question, Which is the way of peace? I have heard some men say with an amazing ignorance that the covenant of the League of Nations was an arrangement for war. Very well, then, what would the other arrangements be? An arrangement for peace? For kindliness? For cooperation? Would everybody beckon us to their markets? Would everybody say, "Come and tell us how to use your money?" Would everybody come and say, "Tell us how much of your goods you want us to take; tell us how much of what Germany is producing you would like when we want it?" I can not bring my credulity up to that point. I have reached years of discretion, and I have met some very young men who knew a great deal more than some very old men.

I want you therefore, after seeing this very ugly picture

that I have painted—for it is an ugly picture; it is a picture from which one turns away with distaste and disgust and says, "That is not America; it is not like anything that we have ever conceived"—I want you to look at the other side. I wonder if some of the gentlemen who are commenting upon this treaty ever read it! If anybody will tell me which of them has not, I will send him a copy. It is written in two languages. On this side is the English and on that side is the French, and since it is evident that some men do not understand English, I hope that they understand French. There are excellent French dictionaries by which they can dig out the meaning, if they can not understand English. It is the plainest English that you could desire, particularly the covenant of the League of Nations. There is not a phrase of doubtful meaning in the whole document.

And what is the meaning? It is that the covenant of the League of Nations is a covenant of arbitration and discussion. Had anybody ever told you that before? I dare say that everybody you have heard talk about this discusses Article X. Well, there are twenty-five other articles in it, and all of them are about something else. They discuss how soon and how quick we can get out of it. Well, I am not a quitter for one. We can get out just so soon as we want to, but we do not want to get out as soon as we get in. And they talk about the Monroe Doctrine, when it expressly says that nothing in that document shall be construed as affecting in any way the validity of the Monroe Doctrine. It says so in so many words. And there are all the other things they talk about to draw your attention away from the essential matter. The essential matter, my fellow citizens, is this: This League will include all the fighting nations of the world, except Germany. The only nations that will not be admitted into it promptly are Germany and Turkey. All the fighting nations of the world are in it, and what do they promise? This is the center

of the document. They promise that they never will go to war without first either submitting the question at issue to arbitration and absolutely abiding by the decision of the arbitrators, or, if they are not willing to submit it to arbitration, submitting it to discussion by the council of the League; that they will give the council of the League six months in which to consider it, and that if they do not like the opinion of the council, they will wait three months after the opinion is rendered before going to war. And I tell you, my fellow citizens, that any nation that is in the wrong and waits nine months before it goes to war never will go to war.

"Ah," but somebody says, "suppose they do not abide by that?" Because all the arguments you hear are based upon the assumption that we are all going to break the covenant, that bad faith is the accepted rule. There has not been any such bad faith among nations in recent times except the flagrant bad faith of the nation we have just been fighting, and that bad faith is not likely to be repeated in the immediate future. Suppose somebody does not abide by those engagements, then what happens? War? No, not war. Something more terrible than war—absolute boycott of the nation violating the covenant. The doors are closed upon her, so that she can not ship anything out or receive anything in. She can not send a letter out or receive one in. No telegraphic message can cross her borders. No person can cross her borders. She is absolutely closed, and all the fighting nations of the world agree to join in the boycott. My own judgment is that war will not be necessary after that. If it is necessary, then it is perfectly evident that the case is one of a nation that wants to run amuck, and if any nation wants to run amuck in modern civilization, we must all see that the outlaw is captured.

I want you to understand, my fellow citizens, that I did not leave Washington and come out on this trip because I doubted what was going to happen. I did not. For one

thing, I wanted to have the pleasure of leaving Washington; and for another thing I wanted to have the very much greater pleasure of feeling the inspiration that I would get from you. Things get very lonely in Washington sometimes. The real voices of the great people of America sometimes sound faint and distant in that strange city! You hear politics until you wish that both parties were smothered in their own gas. I wanted to come out and hear some plain American, hear the kind of talk that I am accustomed to talk, the only kind of talk that I can understand, get the only kind of atmosphere with which I can fill my lungs wholesomely, and, then, incidentally, convey a hint in some quarters that the American people had not forgotten how to think.

This nation went into this war to see it through to the end, and the end has not come yet. This is the beginning, not of the war but of the processes which are going to render a war like this impossible. There are no other processes than those that are proposed in this great treaty. It is a great treaty, it is a treaty of justice, of rigorous and severe justice, but do not forget that there are many other parties to this treaty than Germany and her opponents. There is rehabilitated Poland. There is rescued Bohemia. There is redeemed Jugo-Slavia. There is the rehabilitated Roumania. All the nations that Germany meant to crush and reduce to the status of tools in her own hands have been redeemed by this war and given the guarantee of the strongest nations of the world that nobody shall invade their liberty again. If you do not want to give them that guarantee, then you make it certain that without your guarantee the attempt will be made again, and if another war starts like this one, are you going to keep out of it? If you keep out of this arrangement, that sort of war will come soon. If you go into it, it never will come. We are in the presence, therefore, of the most solemn choice that this people was ever called upon to make. That choice

is nothing less than this: Shall America redeem her pledges to the world? America is made up of the peoples of the world. All the best bloods of the world flow in her veins, all the old affections, all the old and sacred traditions of peoples of every sort throughout the wide world circulate in her veins, and she has said to mankind at her birth: "We have come to redeem the world by giving it liberty and justice." Now we are called upon before the tribunal of mankind to redeem that immortal pledge.

ADDRESS AT CONVENTION HALL, KANSAS CITY, MO.
SEPTEMBER 6, 1919

Mr. Chairman, My Fellow Countrymen:

It is very inspiring to me to stand in the presence of so great a company of my fellow citizens and have the privilege of performing the duty that I have come to perform. That duty is to report to my fellow citizens concerning the work of the peace conference, and every day it seems to me to become more necessary to report, because so many people who are talking about it do not understand what it was.

I came back from Paris bringing one of the greatest documents of human history, and one of the things that made it great was that it was penetrated throughout with the principles to which America has devoted her life. Let me hasten to say that one of the most delightful circumstances of the work on the other side of the water was that I discovered that what we called American principles had penetrated to the heart and to the understanding, not only of the great peoples of Europe, but of the great men who were leading the peoples of Europe, and when these principles were written into this treaty, they were written there by common consent and common conviction. But it remains true, nevertheless, my fellow citizens, that principles are

written into that treaty which were never written into any great international understanding before, and that they had their natural birth and origin in this dear country to which we have devoted our life and service.

I have no hesitation in saying that in spirit and essence it is an American document, and if you will bear with me—for this great subject is not a subject for oratory, it is a subject for examination and discussion—I will remind you of some of the things that we have long desired and which are at last accomplished in this treaty. I think that I can say that one of the things that America has had most at heart throughout her existence has been that there should be substituted for the brutal processes of war the friendly processes of consultation and arbitration, and that is done in the covenant of the League of Nations. I am very anxious that my fellow citizens should realize that that is the chief topic of the covenant of the League of Nations. The whole intent and purpose of the document is expressed in provisions by which all the member States agree that they will never go to war without first having done one or other of two things: Either submitted the matter in controversy to arbitration, in which case they agree to abide by the verdict, or submitted it to discussion in the council of the League of Nations, in which case they consent to allow six months for the discussion and, whether they like the opinion expressed or not, that they will not go to war for three months after that opinion is expressed. So that you have, whether you get arbitration or not, nine months' discussion, and I want to remind you that that is the central principle of some thirty treaties entered into between the United States of America and some thirty other sovereign nations, all of which were confirmed by the Senate of the United States. We have such an agreement with France. We have such an agreement with Great Britain. We have such an agreement with practically every great nation except Germany, which refused to enter into any such

arrangement, because, my fellow citizens, Germany knew that she intended something that did not bear discussion, and that if she had submitted the purpose which led to this war to so much as one month's discussion, she never would have dared go into the enterprise against mankind which she finally did go into. Therefore, I say that this principle of discussion is the principle already adopted by America.

And what is the compulsion to do this? The compulsion is this, that if any member state violates that promise to submit either to arbitration or to discussion, it is thereby ipso facto deemed to have committed an act of war against all the rest. Then, you will ask, "Do we at once take up arms and fight them?" No, we do something very much more terrible than that. We absolutely boycott them. It is provided in that instrument that there shall be no communication even between them and the rest of the world. They shall receive no goods; they shall ship no goods. They shall receive no telegraphic messages; they shall send none. They shall receive no mail; no mail will be received from them. The nationals, the citizens, of the member states will never enter their territory until the matter is adjusted, and their citizens can not leave their territory. It is the most complete boycott ever conceived in a public document, and I want to say to you with confident prediction that there will be no more fighting after that. Gentlemen talk to you as if the most probable outcome of this great combination of all the fighting peoples of the world was going to be fight; whereas, as a matter of fact, the essence of the document is to the effect that the processes shall be peaceful, and peaceful processes are more deadly than the processes of war. Let any merchant put it to himself, that if he enters into a covenant and then breaks it and the people all around him absolutely desert his establishment and will have nothing to do with him—ask him after that if it will be necessary to send the police. The most terrible thing that can happen to an individual,

and the most conclusive thing that can happen to a nation, is to be read out of decent society.

There was another thing that we wished to accomplish which is accomplished in this document. We wanted disarmament, and this document provides in the only possible way for disarmament, by common agreement. Observe, my fellow citizens, that, as I said just now, every great fighting nation in the world is to be a member of this partnership except Germany, and inasmuch as Germany has accepted a limitation of her army to 100,000 men, I do not think for the time being she may be regarded as a great fighting nation. Here in the center of Europe a great nation of more than 60,000,000 that has agreed not to maintain an army of more than 100,000 men, and all around her the rest of the world in concerted partnership to see that no other nation attempts what she attempted, and agreeing among themselves that they will not impose this limitation of armament upon Germany merely, but that they will impose it upon themselves.

You know, my fellow citizens, what armaments mean: Great standing armies and great stores of war material. They do not mean burdensome taxation merely, they do not mean merely compulsory military service which saps the economic strength of the nation, but they mean also the building up of a military class. Again and again, my fellow citizens, in the conference at Paris we were face to face with this circumstance, that in dealing with a particular civil government we found that they would not dare to promise what their general staff was not willing that they should promise; that they were dominated by the military machine which they had created, nominally for their own defence, but really, whether they willed it or not, for the provocation of war. So soon as you have a military class, it does not make any difference what your form of government is, if you are determined to be armed to the teeth, you must obey the orders and directions of the only men who

can control the great machinery of war. Elections are of minor importance, because they determine the political policy, and back of that political policy is the constant pressure of the men trained to arms, enormous bodies of disciplined men, wondering if they are never going to be allowed to use their education and their skill and ravage some great people with the force of arms. That is the meaning of armaments. It is not merely the cost of it, though that is overwhelming, but it is the spirit of it, and America has never and I hope, in the providence of God, never will have, that spirit. There is no other way to dispense with great armaments except by the common agreement of the fighting nations of the world. And here is the agreement. They promise disarmament, and promise to agree upon a plan.

There was something else we wanted that is accomplished by this treaty. We wanted to destroy autocratic authority everywhere in the world. We wanted to see to it that there was no place in the world where a small group of men could use their fellow citizens as pawns in a game; that there was no place in the world where a small group of men, without consulting their fellow citizens, could send their fellow citizens to the battle fields and to death in order to accomplish some dynastic ambition, some political plan that had been conceived in private, some object that had been prepared for by universal, world-wide, intrigue. That is what we wanted to accomplish. The most startling thing that developed itself at the opening of our participation in this war was, not the military preparation of Germany—we were familiar with that, though we had been dreaming that she would not use it—but her political preparation—to find every community in the civilized world was penetrated by her intrigue. The German people did not know that, but it was known on Wilhelmstrasse, where the central offices of the German Government were, and Wilhelmstrasse was the master of the German people. And this war, my fellow

citizens, has emancipated the German people as well as the rest of the world. We do not want to see anything like that happen again, because we know that democracies will sooner or later have to destroy that form of Government, and if we do not destroy it now the job is still to be done. And by a combination of all the great fighting peoples of the world, to see to it that the aggressive purposes of such governments can not be realized, you make it no longer worth while for little groups of men to contrive the downfall of civilization in private conference.

I want to say something about that that has a different aspect, and perhaps you will regard it as a slight digression from the discussion which I am asking you to be patient enough to follow. My fellow citizens, it does not make any difference what kind of a minority governs you if it is a minority, and the thing we must see to is that no minority anywhere masters the majority. That is at the heart, my fellow citizens, of the tragical things that are happening in that great country which we long to help and can find no way that is effective to help. I mean the great realm of Russia. The men who are now measurably in control of the affairs of Russia represent nobody but themselves. They have again and again been challenged to call a constitutional convention. They have again and again been challenged to prove that they had some kind of a mandate, even from a single class of their fellow citizens, and they dare not attempt it. They have no mandate from anybody. There are only 34 of them, I am told, and there were more than 34 men who used to control the destinies of Europe from Wilhelmstrasse. There is a closer monopoly of power in Petrograd and Moscow than there ever was in Berlin, and the thing that is intolerable is, not that the Russian people are having their way, but that another group of men more cruel than the Czar himself is controlling the destinies of that great people.

Then there was another thing we wanted to do, my fel-

low citizens, that is done in this document. We wanted to see that helpless peoples were nowhere in the world put at the mercy of unscrupulous enemies and masters. There is one pitiful example which is in the hearts of all of us. I mean the example of Armenia. There a Christian people is helpless, at the mercy of a Turkish government which thought it the service of God to destroy them; and at this moment, my fellow citizens, it is an open question whether the Armenian people will not, while we sit here and debate, be absolutely destroyed. When I think of words piled on words, of debate following debate, while these unspeakable things that can not be handled until the debate is over are happening in this pitiful part of the world, I wonder that men do not wake up to the moral responsibility of what they are doing. Great populations are driven out upon a desert where there is no food and can be none and there compelled to die, and the men and women and children thrown into a common grave, so imperfectly covered up that here and there is a pitiful arm stretched out to heaven and there is no pity in the world. When shall we wake to the moral responsibility of this great occasion?

There are other aspects to that matter. Not all the populations that are having something that is not a square deal live in Armenia. There are others, and one of the glories of the great document which I brought back with me is this, that everywhere within the area of settlement covered by the political questions involved in that treaty people of that sort have been given their freedom and guaranteed their freedom. But the thing does not end there, because the treaty includes the covenant of the League of Nations, and what does that say? That says that it is the privilege of any member state to call attention to anything, anywhere, that is likely to disturb the peace of the world or the good understanding between nations upon which the peace of the world depends, and every people in the world that has not got what it thinks it ought to have is thereby given a world

forum in which to bring the thing to the bar of mankind. An incomparable thing, a thing that never was dreamed of before! A thing that was never conceived as possible before, that it should not be regarded as an unfriendly act on the part of the representatives of one nation to call attention to something being done within the confines of another empire which was disturbing the peace of the world and the good understanding between nations. There never before has been provided a world forum in which the legitimate grievances of peoples entitled to consideration can be brought to the common judgment of mankind, and if I were the advocate of any suppressed or oppressed people, I surely could not ask any better forum than to stand up before the world and challenge the other party to make good its excuses for not acting in that case. That compulsion is the most tremendous moral compulsion that could be devised by organized mankind.

I think I can take it for granted, my fellow citizens, that you never realized before what a scope this great treaty has. You have been asked to look at so many little spots in it with a magnifying glass that you did not know how big it is, what a great enterprise of the human spirit it is, and what a thoroughly American document it is from cover to cover. It is the first great international agreement in the history of mankind where the principle adopted has been, not the power of the strong but the right of the weak. To reject that treaty, to alter that treaty, is to impair one of the first charters of mankind. Yet there are men who approach the question with passion, with private passion, with party passion, who think only of some immediate advantage to themselves or to a group of their fellow countrymen, and who look at the thing with the jaundice eyes of those who have some private purpose of their own. When at last in the annals of mankind they are gibbeted, they will regret that the gibbet is so high.

I would not have you think that I am trying to char-

acterize those who conscientiously object to anything in this great document. I take off my hat to any man's genuine conscience, and there are men who are conscientiously opposed, though they will pardon me if I say ignorantly opposed. I have no quarrel with them. It has been a pleasure to confer with some of them and to tell them as frankly as I would have told my most intimate friend the whole inside of my mind and of every other mind that I knew anything about that had been concerned with the conduct of affairs at Paris, in order that they might understand this thing and go with the rest of us in the confirmation of what is necessary for the peace of the world. I have no intolerant spirit in the matter, I assure you, but I also assure you that from the bottom of my feet to the top of my head I have got a fighting spirit about it. If anybody dares to defeat this great experiment, then they must gather together the counsellors of the world and do something better. If there is a better scheme, I for one will subscribe to it, but I want to say now, as I said, the other night, it is a case of "put up or shut up." Negation will not serve the world. Opposition constructs nothing. Opposition is the specialty of those who are Bolshevistically inclined—and again I assure you I am not comparing any of my respected colleagues to Bolshevists; I am merely pointing out that the Bolshevist spirit lacks every element of constructiveness. They have destroyed everything and they propose nothing, and while there is a common abhorrence for political Bolshevism, I hope there will not be such a thing growing up in our country as international Bolshevism, the Bolshevism which destroys the constructive work of men who have conscientiously tried to cement the good feeling of the great peoples of the world.

The majestic thing about the League of Nations is that it is to include the great peoples of the world, all except Germany. Germany is one of the great peoples of the world. I would be ashamed not to say that. Those

60,000,000 industrious and inventive and accomplished people are one of the great peoples of the world. They have been put upon. They have been misled. Their minds have been debased by a false philosophy. They have been taught things that the human spirit ought to reject, but they will come out of that nightmare, they will come out of that phantasm, and they will again be a great people. And when they are out of it, when they have got over that dream of conquest and of oppression, when they have shown that their Government really is based upon new principles and upon democratic principles, then we, all of us at Paris agreed that they should be admitted to the League of Nations. In the meantime her one-time partner, Austria, is to be admitted. Hungary, I dare say, will be admitted. The only nations of any consequence outside the League—unless we choose to stay out and go in later with Germany—are Germany and Turkey, and we are just now looking for the pieces of Turkey. She has so thoroughly disintegrated that the process of assembling the parts is becoming increasingly difficult, and the chief controversy now is who shall attempt that very difficult and perilous job?

Is it not a great vision, my fellow citizens, this of the thoughtful world combined for peace, this of all the great peoples of the world associated to see that justice is done, that the strong who intend wrong are restrained and that the weak who can not defend themselves are made secure? We have a problem ahead of us that ought to interest us in this connection. We have promised the people of the Philippine Islands that we will set them free, and it has been one of our perplexities how we should make them safe after we set them free. Under this arrangement it will be safe from the outset. They will become members of the League of Nations, every great nation in the world will be pledged to respect and preserve against external aggression from any quarter the territorial integrity and political independence of the Philippines. It simplifies one of the most perplex-

ing problems that has faced the American public, but it does not simplify our problems merely, gentlemen. It illustrates the triumph of the American spirit. I do not want to attempt any flight of fancy, but I can fancy those men of the first generation that so thoughtfully set this great Government up, the generation of Washington and Hamilton and Jefferson and the Adamses—I can fancy their looking on with a sort of enraptured amazement that the American spirit should have made conquest of the world.

I tell you, my fellow citizens, the war was won by the American spirit. German orders were picked up on the battle field directing the commanders not to let the Americans get hold of a particular post, because you never could get them out again. You know what one of our American wits said, that it took only half as long to train an American army as any other, because you had only to train them to go one way. It is true that they never thought of going any other way, and when they were restrained, because they were told it was premature or dangerous, they were impatient, they said, "We didn't come over here to wait, we came over here to fight," and their very audacity, their very indifference to danger, changed the morale of the battle field. They were not fighting prudently; they were going to get there. And America in this treaty has realized, my fellow countrymen, what those gallant boys we are so proud of fought for. The men who make this impossible or difficult will have a life-long reckoning with the fighting forces of the United States. I have consorted with those boys. I have been proud to call myself their Commander-in-Chief. I did not run the business. They did not need anybody to run it. All I had to do was to turn them loose!

Address at Des Moines, Iowa
September 6, 1919

Mr. Chairman and Fellow Countrymen:

The world is desperately in need of the settled conditions of peace, and it can not wait much longer. It is waiting upon us. That is the thought, that is the burdensome thought, upon my heart tonight, that the world is waiting for the verdict of the nation to which it looked for leadership and which it thought would be the last that would ask the world to wait.

My fellow citizens, the world is not at peace. I suppose that it is difficult for one who has not had some touch of the hot passion of the other side of the sea to realize how all the passions that have been slumbering for ages have been uncovered and released by the tragedy of this war. We speak of the tragedy of this war, but the tragedy that lay back of it was greater than the war itself, because back of it lay long ages in which the legitimate freedom of men was suppressed. Back of it lay long ages of recurrent war in which little groups of men, closeted in capitals, determined whether the sons of the land over which they ruled should go out upon the field and shed their blood. For what? For liberty? No; not for liberty, but for the aggrandizement of those who ruled them. And this had been slumbering in the hearts of men. They had felt the suppression of it. They had felt the mastery of those whom they had not chosen as their masters. They had felt the oppression of laws which did not admit them to the equal exercise of human rights. Now, all of this is released and uncovered and men glare at one another and say, "Now we are free and what shall we do with our freedom?"

What happened in Russia was not a sudden and accidental thing. The people of Russia were maddened with the suppression of Czarism. When at last the chance came to throw off those chains, they threw them off, at first with

hearts full of confidence and hope, and then they found out that they had been again deceived. There was no assembly chosen to frame a constitution for them, or, rather, there was an assembly chosen to choose a constitution for them and it was suppressed and dispersed, and a little group of men just as selfish, just as ruthless, just as pitiless, as the agents of the Czar himself, assumed control and exercised their power by terror and not by right. And in other parts of Europe the poison spread—the poison of disorder, the poison of revolt, the poison of chaos. And do you honestly think, my fellow citizens, that none of that poison has got in the veins of this free people? Do you not know that the world is all now one single whispering gallery? Those antennæ of the wireless telegraph are the symbols of our age. All the impulses of mankind are thrown out upon the air and reach to the ends of the earth; quietly upon steamships, silently under the cover of the Postal Service, with the tongue of the wireless, and the tongue of the telegraph, all the suggestions of disorder are spread through the world. Money coming from nobody knows where is deposited by the millions in capitals like Stockholm, to be used for the propaganda of disorder and discontent and dissolution throughout the world, and men look you calmly in the face in America and say they are for that sort of revolution, when that sort of revolution means government by terror, government by force, not government by vote. It is the negation of everything that is American; but it is spreading, and so long as disorder continues, so long as the world is kept waiting for the answer to the question, What kind of peace are we going to have and what kind of guaranties are there to be behind that peace? That poison will steadily spread more and more rapidly, spread until it may be that even this beloved land of ours will be distracted and distorted by it.

That is what is concerning me, my fellow countrymen. I know the splendid steadiness of the American people,

but, my fellow citizens, the whole world needs that steadiness, and the American people are the makeweight in the fortunes of mankind. How long are we going to debate into which scale we will throw that magnificent equipoise that belongs to us? How long shall we be kept waiting for the answer whether the world may trust us or despise us? They have looked to us for leadership. They have looked to us for example. They have built their peace upon the basis of our suggestions. That great volume that contains the treaty of peace is drawn along the specifications laid down by the American Government, and now the world stands at amaze because an authority in America hesitates whether it will indorse an American document or not.

You know what the necessity of peace is. Political liberty can exist only when there is peace. Social reform can take place only when there is peace. The settlement of every question that concerns our daily life waits for peace. I have been receiving delegations in Washington of men engaged in the service of the Government temporarily in the administration of the railways, and I have had to say to them, "My friends, I can not tell what the railways can earn until commerce is restored to its normal courses. Until I can tell what the railroads can earn I can not tell what the wages that the railroads can pay will be. I can not suggest what the increase of freight and passenger rates will be to meet these increases in wages if the rates must be increased. I can not tell yet whether it will be necessary to increase the rates or not, and I must ask you to wait." But they are not the only people that have come to see me. There are all sorts of adjustments necessary in this country. I have asked representatives of capital and labour to come to Washington next month and confer—confer about the fundamental thing of our life at present; that is to say, the conditions of labour. Do you realize, my fellow citizens, that all through the world the one central question of civilization is, "What shall be the conditions of

labour?" The profound unrest in Europe is due to the doubt prevailing as to what shall be the condition of labour, and I need not tell you that that unrest is spreading to America.

In the midst of the treaty of peace is a Magna Charta, a great guaranty for labour. It provides that labour shall have the counsels of the world devoted to the discussion of its conditions and of its betterment, and labour all over the world is waiting to know whether America is going to take part in those conferences or not. The confidence of the men who sat at Paris was such that they put it in the document that the first meeting of the labour conference under that part of the treaty should take place in Washington upon the invitation of the President of the United States. I am going to issue that invitation, whether we can attend the conference or not. But think of the mortification! Think of standing by in Washington itself and seeing the world take counsel upon the fundamental matter of civilization without us. The thing is inconceivable, but it is true. The world is waiting, waiting to see, not whether we will take part but whether we will serve and lead, for it has expected us to lead. I want to testify that the most touching and thrilling thing that has ever happened to me was what happened almost every day when I was in Paris. Delegations from all over the world came to me to solicit the friendship of America. They frankly told us that they were not sure they could trust anybody else, but that they did absolutely trust us to do them justice and to see that justice was done them. Why, some of them came from countries which I have, to my shame, to admit that I never heard of before, and I had to ask as privately as possible what language they spoke. Fortunately they always had an interpreter, but I always wanted to know at least what family of languages they were speaking. The touching thing was that from the ends of the earth, from little pocketed valleys, where I did not know that a separate people lived, there came men—men of dignity, men of intellectual parts,

men entertaining in their thought and in their memories a great tradition, some of the oldest people of the world—and they came and sat at the feet of the youngest nation of the world and said "Teach us the way to liberty."

That is the attitude of the world, and reflect, my fellow countrymen, upon the reaction, the reaction of despair, that would come if America said, "We do not want to lead you. You must do without our advice. You must shift without us." Now, are we going to bring about a peace, for which everything waits? We can not bring it about by doing nothing. I have been very much amazed and very much amused, if I could be amused in such critical circumstances, to see that the statesmanship of some gentlemen consists in the very interesting proposition that we do nothing at all. I had heard of standing pat before, but I never had before heard of standpatism going to the length of saying it is none of our business and we do not care what happens to the rest of the world.

Your chairman made a profoundly true remark just now. The isolation of the United States is at an end, not because we chose to go into the politics of the world, but because by the sheer genius of this people and the growth of our power we have become a determining factor in the history of mankind, and after you had become a determining factor you can not remain isolated, whether you want to or not. Isolation ended by the processes of history, not by the processes of our independent choice, and the processes of history merely fulfilled the prediction of the men who founded our Republic. Go back and read some of the immortal sentences of the men that assisted to frame this Government and see how they set up a standard to which they intended that the nations of the world should rally. They said to the people of the world, "Come to us; this is the home of liberty; this is the place where mankind can learn how to govern their own affairs and straighten out their own difficulties," and the world did come to us.

Look at your neighbor. Look at the statistics of the people of your State. Look at the statistics of the people of the United States. They have come, their hearts full of hope and confidence, from practically every nation in the world, to constitute a portion of our strength and of our hope and a contribution to our achievement. Sometimes I feel like taking off my hat to some of those immigrants. I was born an American. I could not help it, but they chose to be Americans. They were not born Americans. They saw this star in the west rising over the peoples of the world, and they said, "That is the star of hope and the star of salvation. We will set our footsteps toward the west and join that great body of men whom God has blessed with the vision of liberty." I honor those men. I say, "You made a deliberate choice which showed that you saw what the drift and history of mankind was." I am very grateful, I may say in parentheses, that I did not have to make that choice. I am grateful that ever since I can remember I have breathed this blessed air of freedom. I am grateful that every instinct in me, every drop of blood in me, remembers and stands up and shouts at the traditions of the United States. But some gentlemen are not shouting now about that. They are saying, "Yes; we made a great promise to mankind, but it will cost too much to redeem it." My fellow citizens, that is not the spirit of America, and you can not have peace, you can not have even your legitimate part in the business of the world unless you are partners with the rest. If you are going to say to the world, "We will stand off and see what we can get out of this," the world will see to it that you do not get anything out of it. If it is your deliberate choice that instead of being friends you will be rivals and antagonists, then you will get exactly what rivals and antagonists always get, just as little as can be grudgingly vouchsafed you.

Yet you must keep the world on its feet. Is there any business man here who would be willing to see the world

go bankrupt and the business of the world stop? Is there any man here who does not know that America is the only nation left by the war in a position to see that the world does go on with its business? And is it your idea that if we lend our money, as we must, to men whom we have bitterly disappointed, that money will bring back to us the largess to which we are entitled? I do not like to argue this thing on this basis, but if you want to talk business, I am ready to talk business. If it is a matter of how much you are going to get from your money, I say you will not get half as much as antagonists as you will get as partners. Think that over, if you have none of that thing that is so lightly spoken of, known as altruism. And, believe me, my fellow countrymen, the only people in the world who are going to reap the harvest of the future are the people who can entertain ideals, who can follow ideals to the death.

One of the most beautiful stories I know is the story that we heard in France about the first effect of the American soldiers when they got over there. The French did not believe at first, the British did not believe, that we could finally get 2,000,000 men over there. The most that they hoped at first was that a few American soldiers would restore their morale, for let me say that their morale was gone. The testimony that all of them rendered that they got their morale back the minute they saw the eyes of those boys. Here were not only soldiers. There was no curtain in front of the retina of those eyes. They were American eyes. They were eyes that had seen visions. They were eyes the possessors of which had brought with them a great ardor for a supreme cause, and the reason those boys never stopped was that their eyes were lifted to the horizon. They saw a city not built with hands. They saw a citadel toward which their steps were bent where dwelt the oracles of God himself. And on the battle field were found German orders to commanders here and there to see to it that the Americans did not get lodgment in particular places, be-

cause if they ever did you never could get them out. They had gone to Europe to go the whole way toward the realization of the teaching which their fathers had handed down to them. There never were crusaders that went to the Holy Land in the old ages that we read about that were more truly devoted to a holy cause than these gallant, incomparable sons of America.

My fellow citizens, you have got to make up your minds, because, after all, it is you who are going to make up the minds of this country. I do not owe a report or the slightest responsibility to anybody but you. I do not mean only you in this hall, though I am free to admit that this is just as good a sample of America as you can find anywhere, and the sample looks mighty good to me. I mean you and the millions besides you, thoughtful, responsible American men and women all over this country. They are my bosses, and I am mighty glad to be their servant. I have come out upon this journey not to fight anybody but to report to you, and I am free to predict that if you credit the report there will be no fighting. It is not only necessary that we should make peace with Germany and make peace with Austria, and see that a reasonable peace is made with Turkey and Bulgaria—that is not only not all of it, but it is a very dangerous beginning if you do not add something to it. I said just now that the peace with Germany, and the same is true of the pending peace with Austria, was made upon American specifications, not unwillingly. Do not let me leave the impression on your mind that the representatives of America in Paris had to insist and force their principles upon the rest. That is not true. Those principles were accepted before we got over there, and the men I dealt with carried them out in absolute good faith; but they were our principles, and at the heart of them lay this, that there must be a free Poland, for example.

I wonder if you realize what that means. We had to collect the pieces of Poland. For a long time one piece had

belonged to Russia, and we can not get a clear title to that yet. Another part belonged to Austria. We got a title to that. Another part belonged to Germany, and we have settled the title to that. But we found Germany also in possession of other pieces of territory occupied predominately or exclusively by patriotic Poles, and we said to Germany, "You will have to give that up, too; that belongs to Poland." Not because it is ground, but because those people there are Poles and want to be parts of Poland, and it is not our business to force any sovereignty upon anybody who does not want to live under it. When we had determined the boundaries of Poland we set it up and recognized it as an independent Republic. There is a minister, a diplomatic representative, of the United States at Warsaw right now in virtue of our formal recognition of the Republic of Poland.

But upon Poland center some of the dangers of the future. South of Poland is Bohemia, which we cut away from the Austrian combination. Below Bohemia is Hungary, which can no longer rely upon the assistant strength of Austria, and below her is an enlarged Roumania. Alongside of Roumania is the new Slavic Kingdom, that never could have won its own independence, which had chafed under the chains of Austria-Hungary, but never could throw them off. We have said, "The fundamental wrongs of history center in these regions. These people have the right to govern their own Government and control their own fortunes." That is at the heart of the treaty, but, my fellow citizens, this is at the heart of the future: The business men of Germany did not want the war that we have passed through. The bankers and the manufacturers and the merchants knew that it was unspeakable folly. Why? Because Germany by her industrial genius was beginning to dominate the world economically, and all she had to do was to wait for about two more generations when her credit, her merchandise, her enterprise, would have covered all the parts of the world

that the great fighting nations did not control. The formula of pan-Germanism, you remember, was Bremen to Bagdad —Bremen on the North Sea to Bagdad in Persia. These countries that we have set up as the new home of liberty lie right along that road. If we leave them there without the guaranty that the combined force of the world will assure their independence and their territorial integrity, we have only to wait a short generation when our recent experience will be repeated. We did not let Germany dominate the world this time. Are we then? If Germany had known then that all the other fighting nations of the world would combine to prevent her action, she never would have dreamed of attempting it. If Germany had known—this is the common verdict of every man familiar with the politics of Europe—if Germany had known that England would go in, she never would have started it. If she had known that America would come in, she never would have dreamed of it. And now the only way to make it certain that there never will be another world war like that is that we should assist in guaranteeing the peace and its settlement.

It is a very interesting circumstance, my fellow countrymen, that the League of Nations will contain all the nations of the world, great and small, except Germany, and Germany is merely put on probation. We have practically said to Germany, "If it turns out that you really have had a change of heart and have gotten nonsense out of your system; if it really does turn out that you have substituted a genuine self-governing republic for a kingdom where a few men on Wilhelmstrasse plotted the destiny of the world, then we will let you in as partners, because then you will be respectable." In the meantime, accepting the treaty, Germany's army is reduced to 100,000 men, and she has promised to give up all the war material over and above what is necessary for 100,000 men. For a nation of 60,000,000! She has surrendered to the world. She has said, "Our fate is in your hands. We are ready to do what you tell

us to do." The rest of the world is combined, and the interesting circumstance is that the rest of the world, excluding us, will continue combined if we do not go into it. Some gentlemen seem to think they can break up this treaty and prevent this League by not going into it. Not at all.

I can give you an interesting circumstance. There is the settlement, which you have heard so much discussed, about that rich and ancient province of Shantung in China. I do not like that settlement any better than you do, but these were the circumstances: In order to induce Japan to cooperate in the war and clear the Pacific of the German power England, and subsequently France, bound themselves without any qualification to see to it that Japan got anything in China that Germany had, and that Japan would take it away from her, upon the strength of which promise Japan proceeded to take Kiaochow and occupy the portions of Shantung Province, which had been ceded by China for a term of years to Germany. The most that could be got out of it was that, in view of the fact that America had nothing to do with it, the Japanese were ready to promise that they would give up every item of sovereignty which Germany would otherwise have enjoyed in Shantung Province and return it without restriction to China, and that they would retain in the province only the economic concessions such as other nations already had elsewhere in China —though you do not hear anything about that—concessions in the railway and the mines which had become attached to the railway for operative purposes. But suppose that you say that is not enough. Very well, then, stay out of the treaty, and how will that accomplish anything? England and France are bound and can not escape their obligation. Are you going to institute a war against Japan and France and England to get Shantung back for China? That is an enterprise which does not commend itself to the present generation.

I am putting it in brutal terms, my fellow citizens, but

that is the fact. By disagreeing to that provision, we accomplish nothing for China. On the contrary, we stay out of the only combination of the counsels of nations in which we can be of service to China. With China as a member of the League of Nations, and Japan as a member of the League of Nations, and America as a member of the League of Nations, there confronts every one of them that now famous Article X, by which every member of the League agrees to respect and preserve the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all the other member states. Do not let anybody persuade you that you can take that article out and have a peaceful world. That cuts at the root of the German war. That cuts at the root of the outrage against Belgium. That cuts at the root of the outrage against France. That pulls that vile, unwholesome Upas tree of Pan-Germanism up by the roots, and it pulls all other "pans" up, too. Every land-grabbing nation is served notice, "Keep on your own territory. Mind your own business. That territory belongs to those people and they can do with it what they please, provided they do not invade other people's rights by the use they make of it." My fellow citizens, the thing is going to be done whether we are in it or not. If we are in it, then we are going to be the determining factor in the development of civilization. If we are out of it, we ourselves are going to watch every other nation with suspicion, and we will be justified, too; and we are going to be watched with suspicion. Every movement of trade, every relationship of manufacture, every question of raw materials, every matter that affects the intercourse of the world, will be impeded by the consciousness that America wants to hold off and get something which she is not willing to share with the rest of mankind. I am painting the picture for you, because I know that it is as intolerable to you as it is to me. But do not go away with the impression, I beg you, that I think there is any doubt about the issue. The only thing that can be accomplished is

delay. The ultimate outcome will be the triumphant acceptance of the treaty and the League.

Let me pay the tribute which it is only just that I should pay to some of the men who have been, I believe, misunderstood in this business. It is only a handful of men, my fellow citizens, who are trying to defeat the treaty or to prevent the League. The great majority, in official bodies and out, are scrutinizing it, as it is perfectly legitimate that they should scrutinize it, to see if it is necessary that they should qualify it in any way, and my knowledge of their conscience, my knowledge of their public principle, makes me certain that they will sooner or later see that it is safest, since it is all expressed in the plainest English that the English dictionary affords, not to qualify it—to accept it as it is. I have been a student of the English language all my life and I do not see a single obscure sentence in the whole document. Some gentlemen either have not read it or do not understand the English language; but, fortunately, on the right-hand page it is printed in English and on the left-hand page it is printed in French. Now, if they do not understand English, I hope they will get a French dictionary and dig out the meaning on that side. The French is a very precise language, more precise than the English language, I am told. I am not on a speaking acquaintance with it, but I am told that it is the most precise language in Europe, and that any given phrase in French always means the same thing. That can not be said of English. In order to satisfy themselves, I hope these gentlemen will master the French version and then be reassured that there are no lurking monsters in that document; that there are no sinister purposes; that everything is said in the frankest way.

For example, they have been very much worried at the phrase that nothing in the document shall be taken as impairing in any way the validity of such regional understandings as the Monroe Doctrine. They say, "Why put

in 'such regional understandings as'? What other understandings are there? Have you got something up your sleeve? Is there going to be a Monroe Doctrine in Asia? Is there going to be a Monroe Doctrine in China?" Why, my fellow citizens, the phrase was written in perfect innocence. The men that I was associated with said, "It is not wise to put a specific thing that belongs only to one nation in a document like this. We do not know of any other regional understanding like it; we never heard of any other; we never expect to hear of any other, but there might some day be some other, and so we will say 'such regional understandings as the Monroe Doctrince,'" and their phrase was intended to give right of way to the and their phrase was intended to give right of way to the Monroe Doctrine in the Western Hemisphere. I reminded the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate the other day that the conference I held with them was not the first conference I had held about the League of Nations. When I came back to this our own dear country, in March last I held a conference at the White House with the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and they made various suggestions as to how the covenant should be altered in phraseology. I carried those suggestions back to Paris, and every one of them was accepted. I think that is a sufficient guaranty that no mischief was intended. The whole document is of the same plain, practical, explicit sort, and it secures peace, my fellow citizens, in the only way in which peace can be secured.

Let me remind you that every fighting nation in the world is going to belong to this League, because we are going to belong to it, and they all make this solemn engagement with each other, that they will not resort to war in the case of any controversy until they have done one or other of two things, until they have either submitted the question at issue to arbitration, in which case they promise to abide by the verdict whatever it may be, or, if they do not want to sub-

mit it to arbitration, have submitted it to discussion by the council of the League.

They agree to give the council six months to discuss the matter, to supply the council with all the pertinent facts regarding it, and that, after the opinion of the council is rendered, they will not then go to war if they are dissatisfied with the opinion until three more months have elapsed. They give nine months in which to spread the whole matter before the judgment of mankind, and if they violate this promise, if any one of them violates it, the covenant prescribes that that violation shall in itself constitute an act of war against the other members of the League. It does not provide that there shall be war. On the contrary, it provides for something very much more effective than war. It provides that that nation, that covenant-breaking nation, shall be absolutely cut off from intercourse of every kind with the other nations of the world; that no merchandise shall be shipped out of it or into it; that no postal messages shall go into it or come out of it; that no telegraphic messages shall cross its borders; and that the citizens of the other member states shall not be permitted to have any intercourse or transactions whatever with its citizens or its citizens with them. There is not a single nation in Europe that can stand that boycott for six months. There is not a single nation in Europe that is self-sufficing in its resources of food or anything else that can stand that for six months. And in those circumstances we are told that this covenant is a covenant of war. It is the most drastic covenant of peace that was ever conceived, and its processes are the processes of peace. The nation that does not abide by its covenants is sent to Coventry, is taboo, is put out of the society of covenant-respecting nations.

This is a covenant of compulsory arbitration or discussion, and just so soon as you discuss matters, my fellow citizens, peace looks in at the window. Did you ever really sit down and discuss matters with your neighbor when you

had a difference and come away in the same temper that you went in? One of the difficulties in our labour situation is that there are some employers who will not meet their employees face to face and talk with them. I have never known an instance in which such a meeting and discussion took place that both sides did not come away in a softened temper and with an access of respect for the other side. The processes of frank discussion are the processes of peace not only, but the processes of settlement, and those are the processes which are set up for all the powerful nations of the world.

I want to say that this is an unparalleled achievement of thoughtful civilization. To my dying day I shall esteem it the crowning privilege of my life to have been permitted to put my name to a document like that; and in my judgment, my fellow citizens, when passion is cooled and men take a sober, second thought, they are all going to feel that the supreme thing that America did was to help bring this about and then put her shoulder to the great chariot of justice and of peace which was going to lead men along in that slow and toilsome march, toilsome and full of the kind of agony that brings bloody sweat, but nevertheless going up a slow incline to those distant heights upon which will shine at the last the serene light of justice, suffusing a whole world in blissful peace.

Address at Auditorium, Omaha, Neb.

September 8, 1919

Mr. Chairman, My Fellow Citizens:

I never feel more comfortable in facing my fellow citizens than when I can realize that I am not representing a peculiar cause, that I am not speaking for a single group of my fellow citizens, that I am not the representative of a

party but the representative of the people of the United States. I went across the water with that happy consciousness, and in all the work that was done on the other side of the sea, where I was associated with distinguished Americans of both political parties, we all of us constantly kept at our heart the feeling that we were expressing the thoughts of America, that we were working for the things that America believed in. I have come here to testify that this treaty contains the things that America believes in.

I brought a copy of the treaty along with me, for I fancy that, in view of the criticisms you have heard of it, you thought it consisted of only four or five clauses. Only four or five clauses out of this volume are picked out for criticism. Only four or five phrases in it are called to your attention by some of the distinguished orators who oppose its adoption. Why, my fellow citizens, this is one of the great charters of human liberty, and the man who picks out the flaws that are in it, for there are flaws in it—forgets the magnitude of the thing, forgets the majesty of the thing, forgets that the counsels of more than twenty nations combined and were rendered unanimous in the adoption of this great instrument. Let me remind you of what everybody admits who has read the document. Everybody admits that it is a complete settlement of the matters which led to this war, and that it contains the complete machinery which provides that they shall stay settled.

You know that one of the greatest difficulties in our own domestic affairs is unsettled land titles. Suppose that somebody were mischievously to tamper with the land records of the State of Nebraska, and that there should be a doubt as to the line of every farm. You know what would happen in six months. All the farmers would be sitting on their fences with shotguns. Litigation would penetrate every community, hot feeling would be generated, contests not only of lawyers, but contests of force, would ensue. Very well, one of the interesting things that this treaty

does is to settle the land titles of Europe, and to settle them in this way, on the principle that every land belongs to the people that live on it. This is actually the first time in human history that that principle was ever recognized in a similar document, and yet that is the fundamental American principle. The fundamental American principle is the right of the people that live in the country to say what shall be done with that country. We have gone so far in our assertions of popular right that we not only say that the people have a right to have a government that suits them, but that they have a right to change it in any respect at any time. Very well, that principle lies at the heart of this treaty.

There are peoples in Europe who never before could say that the land they lived in was their own, and the choice that they were to make of their lives was their own choice. I know there are men in Nebraska who come from that country of tragical history, the now restored Republic of Poland, and I want to call your attention to the fact that Poland is here given her complete restitution; and not only is she given the land that formerly belonged to the Poles, but she is given the lands which are now occupied by Poles but had been permitted to remain under other sovereignties. She is given those lands on a principle that all our hearts approve of. Take what in Europe they call High Silesia, the mountainous, the upper, portions of the district of Silesia. The very great majority of the people in High Silesia are Poles, but the Germans contested the statement that most of them were Poles. We said, "Very well, then, it is none of our business; we will let them decide. We will put sufficient armed forces into High Silesia to see that nobody tampers with the processes of the election, and then we will hold a referendum there, and those people can belong either to Germany or to Poland, as they prefer, and not as we prefer." And wherever there was a doubtful district we applied the same principle, that the people

should decide and not the men sitting around the peace table at Paris. When these referenda are completed the land titles of Europe will be settled, and every country will belong to the people that live on it to do with what they please. You seldom hear of this aspect of this treaty, my fellow citizens.

You have heard of the council that the newspaper men call the "big four." We had a very much bigger name for ourselves than that. We called ourselves the "supreme council of the principal allied and associated powers," but we had no official title, and sometimes there were five of us instead of four. Those five represented, with the exception of Germany, of course, the great fighting nations of the world. They could have done anything with this treaty that they chose to do, because they had the power to do it, and they chose to do what had never been chosen before, to renounce every right of sovereignty in that settlement to which the people concerned did not assent. That is the great settlement which is represented in this volume.

And it contains, among other things, a great charter of liberty for the workingmen of the world. For the first time in history the counsels of mankind are to be drawn together and concerted for the purpose of defending the rights and improving the conditions of working people—men, women, and children—all over the world. Such a thing as that was never dreamed of before, and what you are asked to discuss in discussing the League of Nations is the matter of seeing that this thing is not interfered with. There is no other way to do it than by a universal League of Nations, and what is proposed is a universal League of Nations. Only two nations are for the time being left out. One of them is Germany, because we did not think that Germany was ready to come in, because we felt that she ought to go through a period of probation. She says that she made a mistake. We now want her to prove it, by not trying it again. She says that she has abolished all the old forms

of government by which little secret councils of men, sitting nobody knew exactly where, determined the fortunes of that great nation and, incidentally, tried to determine the fortunes of mankind; but we want her to prove that her constitution is changed and that it is going to stay changed; and then who can, after those proofs are produced, say "No" to a great people 60,000,000 strong, if they want to come in on equal terms with the rest of us and do justice in international affairs? I want to say that I did not find any of my colleagues in Paris disinclined to do justice to Germany. But I hear that this treaty is very hard on Germany. When an individual has committed a criminal act, the punishment is hard, but the punishment is not unjust. This nation permitted itself, through unscrupulous governors, to commit a criminal act against mankind, and it is to undergo the punishment, not more than it can endure, but up to the point where it can pay it must pay for the wrong that it has done.

But the things prescribed in this treaty will not be fully carried out if any one of the great influences that brought that result about is withheld from its consummation. Every great fighting nation in the world is on the list of those who are to constitute the League of Nations. I say every great nation, because America is going to be included among them, and the only choice, my fellow citizens, is whether we will go in now or come in later with Germany; whether we will go in as founders of this covenant of freedom or go in as those who are admitted after they have made a mistake and repented.

I wish I could do what is impossible in a great company like this. I wish I could read that covenant to you, because I do not believe, if you have not read it yourself and have only listened to certain speeches that I have read, that you know anything that is in it. Why, my fellow citizens, the heart of that covenant is that there shall be no war. To listen to some of the speeches that you may have listened

to or read, you would think that the heart of it was that it was an arrangement for war. On the contrary, this is the heart of that treaty: The bulk of it is concerned with arrangements under which all the members of the League—that means everybody but Germany and dismembered Turkey—agree that they never will go to war without first having done one or other of two things—either submitted the question at issue to arbitration, in which case they agree absolutely to abide by the verdict, or, if they do not care to submit it to arbitration, submitted it to discussion by the council of the League of Nations, in which case they must give six months for the discussion and wait three months after the rendering of the decision, whether they like it or not, before they go to war. They agree to cool off for nine months before they yield to the heat of passion which might otherwise have hurried them into war.

If they do not do that, it is not war that ensues; it is something that will interest them and engage them very much more than war; it is an absolute boycott of the nation that disregards the covenant. The boycott is automatic, and just as soon as it applies, then this happens: No goods can be shipped out of that country; no goods can be shipped into it. No telegraphic message may pass either way across its borders. No package of postal matter—no letter—can cross its borders either way. No citizen of any member of the League can have any transactions of any kind with any citizen of that nation. It is the most complete isolation and boycott ever conceived, and there is not a nation in Europe that can live for six months without importing goods out of other countries. After they have thought about the matter for six months, I predict that they will have no stomach for war.

All that you are told about in this covenant, so far as I can learn, is that there is an Article X. I will repeat Article X to you; I think I can repeat it verbatim, the heart of it at any rate. Every member of the League

promises to respect and preserve as against external aggression—not as against internal revolution—the territorial integrity and existing political independence of every other member of the League, and if it is necessary to enforce this promise—I mean, for the nations to act in concert with arms in their hands to enforce it—then the council of the League shall advise what action is necessary. Some gentlemen who doubt the meaning of English words have thought that advice did not mean advice, but I do not know anything else that it does mean, and I have studied English most of my life and speak it with reasonable correctness. The point is this: The council can not give that advice without the vote of the United States, unless it is a party to the dispute; but, my fellow citizens, if you are a party to the dispute you are in the scrap anyhow. If you are a party, then the question is not whether you are going to war or not, but merely whether you are going to war against the rest of the world or with the rest of the world, and the object of war in that case will be to defend that central thing that I began by speaking about. That is the guaranty of the land titles of the world which have been established by this treaty. Poland, Czechoslavakia, Roumania, Jugoslavia—all those nations which never had a vision of independent liberty until now—have their liberty and independence guaranteed to them. If we do not guarantee them, then we have this interesting choice: I hear gentlemen say that we went into the recent war because we were forced into it, and their preference now is to wait to be forced in again. They do not pretend that we can keep out; they merely pretend that we ought to keep out until we are ashamed not to go in.

This is the covenant of the League of Nations that you hear objected to, the only possible guaranty against war. I would consider myself recreant to every mother and father, every wife and sweetheart in this country, if I consented to the ending of this war without a guaranty that there would

be no other. You say, "Is it an absolute guaranty?" No; there is no absolute guaranty against human passion; but even if it were only 10 per cent. of a guaranty, would not you rather have 10 per cent. guaranty against war than none? If it only creates a presumption that there will not be war, would you not rather have that presumption than live under the certainty that there will be war? For, I tell you, my fellow citizens, I can predict with absolute certainty that within another generation there will be another world war if the nations of the world do not concert the method by which to prevent it.

But I did not come here this morning, I remind myself, so much to expound the treaty as to talk about these interesting things that we hear about that are called reservations. A reservation is an assent with a big but. We agree —but. Now, I want to call your attention to some of these buts. I will take them, so far as I can remember the order, in the order in which they deal with clauses of the League itself.

In the first article of the covenant it is provided that a nation can withdraw from the League on two years' notice, provided at the time of its withdrawal, that is to say, at the expiration of the two years, it has fulfilled all its international obligations and all its obligations under the covenant. Some of our friends are very uneasy about that. They want to sit close to the door with their hands on the knob, and they want to say, "We are in this thing but we are in it with infinite timidity; we are in it only because you overpersuaded us and wanted us to come in, and we are going to try this thing every now and then and see if it is locked, and just as soon as we see anything we don't like, we are going to scuttle." Now, what is the trouble? What are they afraid of? I want you to put this to every man you know who makes this objection, what is he afraid of? Is he afraid that when the United States withdraw it will not have fulfilled its international obligations? Is he willing to

bring that indictment against this beloved country? My fellow citizens, we never did fail to fulfill an international obligation and, God guiding and helping us, we never will. I for one am not going to admit in any connection the slightest doubt that, if we ever choose to withdraw, we will then have fulfilled our obligations. If I make reservations, as they are called, about this, what do I do? This covenant does not set up any tribunal to judge whether we have fulfilled our obligations at that time or not. There is only one thing to restrain us, and that is the opinion of mankind. Are these gentlemen such poor patriots that they are afraid that the United States will cut a poor figure in the opinion of mankind? And do they think that they can bring this great people to withdraw from that League if at that time their withdrawal would be condemned by the opinion of mankind? We have always been at pains to earn the respect of mankind, and we shall always be at pains to retain it. I for one am too proud as an American to say that any doubt will ever hang around our right to withdraw upon the condition of the fulfillment of our international obligations.

They do not like the way in which the Monroe Doctrine is mentioned. Well, I would not stop on a question of style. The Monroe Doctrine is adopted. It is swallowed, hook, line, and sinker, and, being carefully digested into the central organism of the whole instrument, I do not care what language they use about it. The language is entirely satisfactory so far as I understand the English language. That puzzles me, my fellow citizens. The English language seems to have got some new meaning since I studied it that bothers these gentlemen. I do not know what dictionaries they resort to. I do not know what manuals of conscience they can possibly resort to. The Monroe Doctrine is expressly authenticated in this document, for the first time in history, by all the great nations of the world, and it was put there at our request.

The fourth matter that they are concerned about is domestic questions, so they want to put in a reservation enumerating certain questions as domestic questions which everybody on both sides of the water admits are domestic questions. That seems to me, to say the least, to be a work of supererogation. It does not seem to me necessary to specify what everybody admits, but they are so careful—I believe the word used to be "meticulous"—that they want to put in what is clearly implied in the whole instrument. "Well," you say, "why not?" Well, why not, my fellow citizens? The conference at Paris will still be sitting when the Senate of the United States has acted upon this treaty. Perhaps I ought not to say that so confidently. No man, even in the secrets of Providence, can tell how long it will take the United States Senate to do anything, but I imagine that in the normal course of human fatigue the Senate will have acted upon this treaty before the conference in Paris gets through with the Austrian treaty and the Bulgarian treaty and the Turkish treaty. They will still be there on the job. Now—every lawyer will follow me in this—if you take a contract and change the words, even though you do not change the sense, you have to get the other parties to accept those words. Is not that true? Therefore every reservation will have to be taken back to all the signatories of this treaty, and I want you to notice that that includes Germany. We will have to ask Germany's consent to read this treaty the way we understand it. I want to tell you that we did not ask Germany's consent with regard to the meaning of any one of those terms while we were in Paris. We told her what they meant and said, "Sign here." Are there any patriotic Americans who desire the method changed? Do they want me to ask the assembly at Weimar if I may read the treaty the way it means but in words which the United States Senate thinks it ought to have been written in? You see, reservations come down to this, that they want to change the language

of the treaty without changing its meaning and involve all the embarrassments. Because, let me say, there are indications—I am judging not from official dispatches but from the newspapers—that people are not in as good a humor over in Paris now as they were when I was there, and it is going to be more difficult to get agreement from now on than it was then. After dealing with some of those gentlemen I found that they were as ingenious as any American in attaching unexpected meanings to plain words, and, having gone through the mill on the existing language, I do not want to go through it again on changed language.

I must not turn away from this great subject without adverting to one particular in the treaty itself, and that is the provision with regard to the transfer of certain German rights in the Province of Shantung, China, to Japan. I have frankly said to my Japanese colleagues in the conference, and therefore I can without impropriety say it here, that I was very deeply dissatisfied with that part of the treaty. But, my fellow citizens, Japan agreed at that very time, and as part of the understanding upon which those clauses were put into the treaty, that she would relinquish every item of sovereignty that Germany had enjoyed to China, and that she would retain only what other nations have elsewhere in China, certain economic concessions with regard to the railway and the mines, which she was to operate under a corporation and subject to the laws of China. As I say, I wish she could have done more. But suppose, as some have suggested, that we dissent from that clause in the treaty. You can not sign all of the treaty but one part, my fellow citizens. It is like the President's veto. He can not veto provisions in a bill. He has got either to sign the bill or veto the bill. We can not sign the treaty with the Shantung provision out of it, and if we could, what sort of service would we be doing to China?

Let us state the facts with brutal frankness. England and France are bound by solemn treaty, entered into before

the conference at Paris, before the end of the war, to give Japan what she gets in this treaty in the Province of Shantung. They can not in honor withdraw from that promise. They can not consent to a peace treaty which does not contain those provisions with regard to Shantung. England and France, therefore, will stand behind Japan, and if we are not signatories to the treaties and not parties she will get all that Germany had in Shantung, more than she will get under the promises which she made to us, and the only way we can get it away from her is by going to war with Japan and Great Britain and France. Does that look like a workable proposition? Is that doing China a service? Whereas, if we do accept this treaty, we are members of the League of Nations, China is a member of the League, and Japan is a member of the League, and under that much-criticized Article X Japan promises and we guarantee that the territorial integrity and political independence of China will be respected and preserved. That is the way to serve China. That is the only possible way in the circumstances to serve China.

Therefore we can not rewrite this treaty. We must take it or leave it, and gentlemen, after all the rest of the world has signed it, will find it very difficult to make any other kind of treaty. As I took the liberty of saying the other night, it is a case of "put up or shut up." The world can not breathe in the atmosphere of negations. The world can not deal with nations who say, "We won't play!" The world can not have anything to do with an arrangement in which every nation says, "We will take care of ourselves." Is it possible, my fellow citizens—is it possible, for the sinister thing has been suggested to me—that there is a group of individuals in this country who have conceived it as desirable that the United States should exercise its power alone, should arm for the purpose, should be ready for the enterprise, and should dominate the world by arms? There are indications that there are groups of citizens in this

country who do not find that an unpalatable program. Are we going to substitute for Pan Germanism a sinister Pan Americanism? The thing is inconceivable. It is hideous. No man dare propose that in plain words to any American audience anywhere. The heart of this people is pure. The heart of this people is true. This great people loves liberty. It loves justice. It would rather have liberty and justice than wealth and power. It is the great idealistic force of history, and the idealism of America is what has made conquest of the spirits of men.

I said just now at the opening that I was happy to forget on a campaign like this what party I belonged to, and I hope that you will not think that I am recalling what party I belong to if I say how proud I have been to stand alongside of Senator Hitchcock in this fight. I would be just as glad to stand by Senator Norris if he would let me. I refer to Senator Hitchcock because I know this is his home town and because of my personal regard for him, and because I wanted to make it the preface to say I want to be the brother and comrade and coworker of every man who will work for this great cause. It heartens me when I find, as I found in Des Moines and I find here, that there are more Republicans on the committees that meet me than Democrats. That may be in proportion to the population, but nevertheless I judge from what I see of these gentlemen that they are, at any rate, very favorable specimens and that I can take it for granted, because of what I see in my dealing with them, that they do represent some of the permanence and abiding influences of great communities like this. Why, the heart of America beats in these great prairies and on these hillsides. Sometimes in Washington you seem very far away. The voices that are most audible in Washington are not voices that anybody cares to listen to for very long, and it is refreshing to get out among the great body of one's fellow citizens and feel the touch of hand and the contact of shoulder and the impulse of mass

movement which is going to make spiritual conquest of the world.

Address at Coliseum, Sioux Falls, So. Dak.

September 8, 1919

Governor Norbeck, My Fellow Citizens:

I must admit that every time I face a great audience of my fellow countrymen on this trip I am filled with a feeling of peculiar solemnity, because I believe, my fellow countrymen, that we have come to one of the turning points in the history of the world, and what I as an American covet for this great country is that, as on other great occasions when mankind's fortunes hung in a nice poise and balance, America may have the distinction to lead the way.

I want to remind you, my fellow countrymen, that that war was not an accident. That war did not just happen. There was not some sudden occasion which brought on a conflagration. On the contrary, Germany had been preparing for that war for generations. Germany had been preparing every resource, perfecting every skill, developing every invention, which would enable her to master the European world; and, after mastering the European world, to dominate the rest of the world. Everybody had been looking on. Everybody had known. For example, it was known to every war office in Europe, and in the War Department at Washington, that the Germans not only had a vast supply of great field guns but that they had ammunition enough for every one of those guns to exhaust the gun. Yet we were all living in a fool's paradise. We thought Germany meant what she said—that she was armed for defense; and that she never would use that great store of force against the rest of her fellow men. Why, my friends, it was foreordained the minute Germany conceived these purposes that she should do the thing which she did in 1914.

That assassination of the Austrian Crown Prince in Serbia was not what started the war. They were ready to start it and merely made that an occasion and an excuse. Before they started it, Serbia had yielded to practically every demand they made of her, and they would not let the rest of the world know that Serbia had yielded, because they did not want to miss the occasion to start the war. They were afraid that other nations would prepare. They were afraid that they had given too much indication of what they were going to do and they did not want to wait. What immediately happened, when the other foreign offices of Europe learned of what was going on, was that from every other foreign office, so far as I have been able to learn, messages went to Berlin instructing their representatives to suggest to the German Government that the other Governments be informed and that an opportunity be obtained for a discussion, so as to see if war could not be avoided. And Germany did not dare discuss her purpose for twenty-four hours.

I have brought back from Europe with me, my fellow citizens, a treaty in which Germany is disarmed and in which all the other nations of the world agree never to go to war without first of all having done one or other of two things, either having submitted the question in dispute to arbitration, in which case they will abide by the verdict, or, if they do not care to submit it to arbitration, having submitted it to discussion by the League of Nations; that they will allow six months for the discussion; that they will publish all the facts to all the world; and that not until three months after the expiration of the six will they go to war. There is a period of nine months of cooling off, and Germany did not dare cool off for nine days! If Germany had dreamed that anything like the greater part of the world would combine against her, she never would have begun the war, and she did not dare to let the opinion of mankind crystallize against her by the discussion of the purposes which she had in mind. What I want to point out to you

tonight is that we are making a fundamental choice. You have either got to have the old system, of which Germany was the perfect flower, or you have got to have a new system. You can not have a new system unless you provide a substitute, an adequate substitute, for the old, and when certain of our fellow citizens take the position that we do not want to go into any combination at all but want to take care of oursleves, all I have to say to them is that that is exactly the German position.

Germany through the mouth of her Emperor—Germany through the mouths of her orators—Germany through the pens of her writers of all sorts—said, "Here we stand, ready to take care of ourselves. We will not enter into any combination. We are armed for self-defense and no nation dares interfere with our rights." That, it appears, is the American program in the eyes of some gentlemen; and I want to tell you that within the last two weeks the pro-German element in this country has lifted its head again. It is again heartened. It again has air in its lungs. It again says, "Ah, now we see a chance when America and Germany will stand outside this League and take care of themselves." Not take care of themselves as partners, I do not mean to intimate that, but where America will play the same rôle that Germany plays, under that old order which brought us through that agony of bloody sweat, that great agony in which the whole world seemed to be caught in the throes of a crisis, when for a long time we did not know whether civilization itself was going to survive or not. And do not believe, my fellow countrymen, that civilization is saved now. There were passions let loose upon the field of the world by that war which have not grown quiet yet, which will not grow quiet for a long time, and every element of disorder, every element of chaos, is hoping that there may be no steadying hand from a council of nations to hold the order of the world steady until we can make the final arrangements of justice and of peace. The treaty of peace

with Germany is very much more than a treaty of peace with Germany. The German part of it takes a good many words, because there are a great many technical details to be arranged, but that is not the heart of the treaty. The heart of the treaty is that it undoes the injustice that Germany did; that it not only undoes the injustice that Germany did but it organizes the world to see that such injustice will in the future be impossible.

And not forgetting, but remembering with intense sympathy the toiling mass of mankind, the conference at Paris wrote into the heart of that treaty a great charter of labour. I think that those of us who live in this happy land can have little conception of the conditions of labour in some of the European countries up to the period of the outbreak of this war, and one of the things that that treaty proposes to do is to organize the opinion of all nations to assist in the betterment and the release of the great forces of labour throughout the world. It is a labouring man's treaty in the sense that it is the average man's treaty. Why, my fellow citizens, the thing that happened at Paris was absolutely and literally unprecedented. There never was a gathering of the leading statesmen of the world before who did not sit down to divide the spoils, to make the arrangements the most advantageous that they could devise for their own strong and powerful governments. Yet this gathering of statesmen sat themselves down to do something which a friend of mine the other day very aptly described as establishing the land titles of the world, because the principle underlying the treaty was that every land belonged to the native stock that lived in it, and that nobody had the right to dictate either the form of government or the control of territory to those people who were born and bred and had their lives and happiness to make there. The principle that nobody has the right to impose the sovereignty of any alien government on anybody was for the first time recognized in the counsels of international deliberation. In this League

of Nations covenant, which some men ask you to examine in a spot here and there with a magnifying glass, there lies at the heart of it this great principle, nobody has the right to take any territory any more.

You will see what our situation was: The Austrian Empire, for example, had gone to pieces, and here we were with the pieces on the table. The Austrian treaty is not yet completed, but it is being made on the same principle as the German, and will serve as an illustration. In the old days they would have compacted it between armies. They did not do that this time. They said, "This piece belongs to the Poles and to nobody else. This piece belongs to the Bohemians and to nobody else. This piece belongs to Roumania, though she never could have got it for herself; we are going to turn it over to her, though other people want it. This piece belongs to the Slavs, who live in the northern Balkans—the Jugo-Slavs as we have come to know them to be—and they shall have what belongs to them." When we turned to the property of Germany, which she had been habitually misgoverning—I mean the German colonies, particularly the colonies in Africa—there were many nations who would like to have had those rich, undeveloped portions of the world; but none of them got them. We adopted the principle of trusteeship. We said, "We will put you in charge of this, that, and the other piece of territory, and you will make an annual report to us. We will deprive you of your trusteeship whenever you administer it in a way which is not approved by our judgment, and we will put upon you this primary limitation, that you shall do nothing that is to the detriment of the people who live in that territory. You shall not enforce labour on it, and you shall apply the same principles of humanity to the work of their women and children that you apply at home. You shall not allow the illicit trade in drugs and in liquors. You shall not allow men who want to make money out of powder and shot to sell arms and ammunition to those who

can use them to their own disadvantage. You shall not make those people fight in your armies. The country is theirs, and you must remember that and treat it as theirs." There is no more annexation. There is no more land grabbing. There is no more extension of sovereignty. It is an absolute reversal of history, an absolute revolution in the way in which international affairs are treated; and it is all in the covenant of the League of Nations.

The old system was, Be ready, and we can be ready. I have heard gentlemen say, "America can take care of herself." Yes, she can take care of herself. Every man would have to train to arms. We would have to have a great standing army. We would have to have accumulations of military material such as Germany used to have. We would enjoy the luxuries of taxes even higher than we pay now. We could accumulate our force, and then our force would have to be directed by some kind of sufficiently vigorous central power. You would have a military government in spirit if not in form. No use having a fighting nation if there is not somebody to swing it! If you do not want your President to be a representative of the civil purposes of this country, you can turn him into merely a commander-in-chief, ready to fight the world. But if you did nobody would recognize America in those strange and altered circumstances. All the world would stand at amaze and say, "Has America forgotten everything that she ever professed?" The picture is one that every American repudiates; and I challenge any man who has that purpose at the back of his thought to avow it. If he comes and tells you that America must stand alone and take care of herself, ask him how it is going to be done, and he will not dare tell you, because you would show him the door and say, "We do not know any such American."

Yet we can not do without force. You can not establish land titles, as I have expressed it, and not maintain them. Suppose that the land titles of South Dakota were dis-

turbed. Suppose the farm lines were moved, say, ten feet. You know what would happen. Along every fence line you would see farmers perching with guns on their knees. The only reason they are not perching now is that there are land deeds deposited in a particular place, and the whole majesty and force and judicial system of the State of South Dakota are behind the titles. Very well, we have got to do something like that internationally. You can not set up Poland, whom all the world through centuries has pitied and sympathized with, as the owner of her property and not have somebody take care that her title deeds are respected. You can not establish freedom, my fellow citizens, without force, and the only force you can substitute for an armed mankind is the concerted force of the combined action of mankind through the instrumentality of all the enlightened Governments of the world. This is the only conceivable system that you can substitute for the old order of things which brought the calamity of this war upon us and would assuredly bring the calamity of another war upon us. Your choice is between the League of Nations and Germanism. I have told you what I mean by Germanism —taking care of yourselves, being armed and ready, having a chip on your shoulder, thinking of nothing but your own rights and never thinking of the rights of anybody else, thinking that you were put into this world to see that American might was asserted and forgetting that American might ought never to be used against the weak, ought never to be used in an unjust cause, ought never to be used for aggression; ought to be used with the heart of humanity beating behind it.

Sometimes people call me an idealist. Well, that is the way I know I am an American. America, my fellow citizens —I do not say it in disparagement of any other great people—America is the only idealistic nation in the world. When I speak practical judgments about business affairs, I can only guess whether I am speaking the voice of America

or not, but when I speak the ideal purposes of history I know that I am speaking the voice of America, because I have saturated myself since I was a boy in the records of that spirit, and everywhere in them there is this authentic tone of the love of justice and the service of humanity. If by any mysterious influence of error America should not take the leading part in this new enterprise of concerted power, the world would experience one of those reversals of sentiment, one of those penetrating chills of reaction, which would lead to a universal cynicism, for if America goes back upon mankind, mankind has no other place to turn. It is the hope of nations all over the world that America will do this great thing. Yet I find some gentlemen so nervous about doing right that their eyes rest very uneasily on the first article of the covenant of the League of Nations, and they say "That says that we can get out after two years' notice, if we have fulfilled all our international obligations at that time. Now, we want to make it perfectly clear that we will get out when we want to." You can not make it perfectly clear in the way they want it, unless you make it perfectly clear at the outset that you want to get out. You can not choose the seat by the door and keep fumbling with the knob without creating the impression that you are going to get out in a minute; that you do not like the company you are in; that you do not like the job; that you are by constitution and disposition a scuttler! If America goes into this thing, she is going to stay in, and she is going to stay in in order to see that justice is done. She can see to it, because if you read this covenant of the League you will find that, America being one of the members of the council of the League, nothing material can be done under that League without a unanimous vote of the council. America can determine what action is going to be taken. No action that is against her policy or against her will can be taken, unless her judgment is rendered in some case where she is one of the

disputants, but, my fellow citizens, if she is one of the disputants, she is in trouble anyhow. If the war that they are trying to avert is her war, then I do not see that she is any more benefited by being out of the League than in it. On the contrary, if she is in the League, she has at least the good offices of other friendly states to see that some accommodation is reached.

And she is doing exactly what she has done already. Some gentlemen forget that we already have nearly thirty treaties with the leading nations of the world. Yes; and to do the very thing that is in this covenant, only we agree to take twelve months to discuss everything, whereas the League gives nine months. The American choice would be twelve. We promise not to fight without first talking. I want to call a great many here witness to this circumstance, for I am sure by looking at you that you know something about it. What is the certain way to have difficulty between capital and labor? It is to refuse to sit down in the same room and talk it over. I can not understand why one man or set of men should refuse to discuss claims or grievances with another set of men, unless they know to begin with that they are wrong. I am very averse from discussing anything when I know I have got the wrong end, but when I think I have got either the right end or as good an end as the other fellow, then I am perfectly willing to discuss it. There is an old saying accredited to a rather cynical politician of what I hope I may regard as the older school, who said to his son, "John, do not bother your head about lies; they will take care of themselves; but if you ever hear me denying anything, you may be sure it is so." The only thing we are afraid of, the only thing we dodge, is the truth. If we see facts coming our way, it is just as well to get out of the way. Always take this attitude, my friends, towards facts; Always try to see them coming first, so that they will not catch you at unawares. So with all matters, grading up from the smallest to the greatest. Hu-

man beings can get together by discussion, and it is the business of civilization to get together by discussion and not by fighting. That is civilization. The only reason this country is civilized is because we do not let two men who have a difference fight one another. We say, "Wait a minute; we have arranged for that. Just around the corner there you will find a courthouse. On certain days the court is sitting. Go and state the matter to those men, and neither before nor after the decision shall you touch one another." That is civilization. You have got the ordered processes of consultation and discussion. You have got to act by rule, and justice consists in applying the same rule to everybody, not one rule to the rich man and another to the poor; not one rule to the employer and another to the employee, but the same rule to the strong and to the weak.

That is exactly what is attempted in this treaty. I can not understand the psychology of men who are resisting it. I can not understand what they are afraid of, unless it is that they know physical force and do not understand moral force. Moral force is a great deal more powerful than physical. Govern the sentiments of mankind and you govern mankind. Govern their fears, govern their hopes, determine their fortunes, get them together in concerted masses, and the whole thing sways like a team. Once get them suspecting one another, once get them antagonizing one another, and society itself goes to pieces. We are trying to make a society instead of a set of barbarians out of the governments of the world. I sometimes think, when I wake in the night, of all the wakeful nights that anxious fathers and mothers and friends have spent during those weary years of this awful war, and I seem to hear the cry, the inarticulate cry of mothers all over the world, millions of them on the other side of the sea and thousands of them on this side of the sea, "In God's name, give us the sensible and hopeful and peaceful processes of right and of justice!"

America can stay out, but I want to call you to witness

that the peace of the world can not be established without America. America is necessary to the peace of the world. And reverse the proposition: The peace and good will of the world are necessary to America. Disappoint the world, center its suspicion upon you, make it feel that you are hot and jealous rivals of the other nations, and do you think you are going to do as much business with them as you would otherwise do? I do not like to put the thing on that plane, my fellow countrymen, but if you want to talk business, I can talk business. If you want to put it on the low plane of how much money you can make, you can make more money out of friendly traders than out of hostile traders. You can make more money out of men who trust you than out of men who fear you. You can bring about a state of mind where by every device possible foreign markets will be closed to you, and men will say, "No; the wheat of America tastes bitter; we will eat the wheat of Argentina; we will eat the wheat of Australia, for that is the wheat of friendship, and this is the wheat of antagonism. We do not want to wear clothes made out of American cotton; we are going to buy just as much cotton from India as we can. We are going to develop new cotton fields. America is up to something; we do not know just what, and we are going to shut and lock every door we can against her." You can get the world in that temper. Do you think that would be profitable? Do you think there is money in that? But I am not going to dwell upon that side of it. I am just as sure of what you are thinking as I am of what I am thinking. We are not thinking of money. We would rather retain the reputation of America than have all the money in the world. I am not ready to die for money, and neither are you, but you are ready and I am ready to die for America.

A friend of mine made a very poignant remark to me one day. He said: "Did you ever see a family that hung its son's yardstick or ledger or spade up over the mantel-

piece?" But how many of you have seen the lad's rifle, his musket, hung up! Well, why? A musket is a barbarous thing. The spade and the yardstick and the ledger are the symbols of peace and of steady business; why not hang them up? Because they do not represent self-sacrifice. They do not glorify you. They do not dignify you in the same sense that the musket does, because when you took that musket at the call of your country you risked everything and knew you could not get anything. The most that you could do was to come back alive, but after you came back alive there was a halo about you. That boy was in France! That boy served his country and served a great cause! That boy risked everything to see that the weak peoples of the world were redeemed from intolerable tyranny. Here comes—ah, how I wish I were going to be in Washington on the 17th—here comes, do you not hear it, the tread of the First Division; those men, along with their comrades, to whom the eyes of all Europe turn! All Europe took heart when they saw that brilliant flag unfurled on French soil.

Did you ever hear that thrilling song that is being sung so much now of the blind Frenchman wishing to know if the Americans had come, bidding his son watch at the window. "Look, my lad, what are they carrying? What are the colors? Are they red stripes upon a field of white? Is there a piece of heaven in the corner? Is that piece of heaven full of stars? Ah, the Americans have come! Thank God, the Americans have come!" That is what we have at our hearts, my fellow citizens, and we hang the musket up, or the sword, over the mantelpiece. And if the lad is gone, and dead, we share the spirit of a noble lady, who said to me, without the glimmer of a tear in her eye: "I have had the honor of losing a son upon the fields of France. I have had the honor, not the pain. I have had the distinction of losing a son of mine upon the field of honor." It is that field of honor that we are going to re-

deem. We are not going to redeem it with blood any more, but we are going to make out of the counsels of the people of the world counsels of peace and of justice and of honor.

ADDRESS BEFORE STATE LEGISLATURE, ST. PAUL, MINN.

SEPTEMBER 9, 1919

Mr. Speaker, Your Excellency, Gentlemen of the Legislature, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I esteem it an unusual privilege to stand in this place today and to address the members of this great body, because the errand upon which I have left Washington is so intimate a matter of the life of our own nation as well as of the life of the world. Yet I am conscious, standing in this presence, that perhaps the most appropriate things I could allude to are those which affect us immediately. I know that you have been called together in special session for special objects. One of those objects you have achieved, and I rejoice with you in the adoption of the suffrage amendment. Another of the objects, I understand, is to consider the high cost of living, and the high cost of living is one of those things which are so complicated; it ramifies in so many directions that it seems to me we can not do anything in particular without knowing how the particulars affect the whole. It is dangerous to play with a complicated piece of machinery, piece by piece, unless you know how the pieces are related to each other.

The cost of living at present is a world condition. It is due to the fact that the man power of the world has been sacrificed in the agony of the battle field and that all the processes of industry have been either slackened or diverted. The production of foodstuffs, the production of clothing, the production of all the necessaries of life has

either been slackened or it has been turned into channels which are not immediately useful for the general civil population. Great factories, as I need not tell you, in our own country which were devoted to the uses of peace have recently been diverted in such fashion as to serve the purposes of war, and it will take a certain length of time to restore them to their old adjustments, to put their machinery to the old uses again, to redistribute labour so that it will not be concentrated upon the manufacture of munitions and the other stuffs necessary for war, but will be devoted to the general processes of production so necessary for our life.

Back of all that—and I do not say this merely for an argumentative reason, but because it is true—back of that lies the fact that we have not yet learned what the basis of peace is going to be. The world is not going to settle down, my fellow citizens, until it knows what part the United States is going to play in the peace. And that for a very interesting reason. The strain put upon the finances of the other Governments of the world has been all but a breaking strain. I imagine that it will be several generations before foreign Governments can finally adjust themselves to carrying the overwhelming debts which have been accumulated in this war. The United States has accumulated a great debt, but not in proportion to those that other countries have accumulated when you reckon our wealth as compared with theirs. We are the only nation in the world that is likely in the immediate future to have a sufficient body of free capital to put the industrial world, here and elsewhere, on its feet again. Until the industrial world here and elsewhere is put on its feet you can not finally handle the question of the cost of living, because the cost of living in the last analysis depends upon the things we are always talking about but do not know how to manage—the law of supply and demand. It depends upon manufacture and distribution. It depends upon all the nor-

mal processes of the industrial and commercial world. It depends upon international credit. It depends upon shipping. It depends upon the multiplication of transportation facilities domestically. Our railroads at this moment are not adequate to moving the commerce of this country. Every here and there they run through a little neck—for example, the Pennsylvania system at Pittsburgh—where everything is congested and you are squeezing a great commerce through a little aperture. Terminal facilities at the ports are not adequate. The problem grows the more you think of it. What we have to put our minds to is an international problem, first of all—to set the commerce of the world going again and the manufacture of the world going again. And we have got to do that largely. Then we have got to see that our own production and our own methods of finance and our own commerce are quickened in every way that is possible. And then we, sitting in legislatures like this and in the Congress of the United States, have to see to it, if you will permit a vulgar expression, that "nobody monkeys with the process."

I understand that one of the excellent suggestions made by your governor is that you look into the matter of cold storage. Well, there are other kinds of storage besides cold storage. There are all sorts of ways of governing and concentrating the reserve stocks of goods. You do not have to keep everything cold, though you can keep the cold hand of control on it; you can manage by a concert that need not be put on paper to see to it that goods are doled out to the market so that they will not get there so fast as to bring the price down. The communities of the United States are entitled to see that these dams are removed and that the waters that are going to fructify the world flow in their normal courses. It is not easy. It is not always pleasant. You do not like to look censoriously into the affairs of your fellow citizens too much or too often, but it is necessary to look with a very unsympathetic eye at some of the processes

which are retarding distribution and the supply which is going to meet the demand.

Not only that, but we have got to realize that we are face to face with a great industrial problem which does not center in the United States. It centers elsewhere, but which we share with the other countries of the world. That is the relation between capital and labour, between those who employ and those who are employed, and we might as well sit up straight and look facts in the face, gentlemen. The labouring men of the world are not satisfied with their relations with their employers. Of course, I do not mean to say that there is universal dissatisfaction, because here, there, and elsewhere, in many cases fortunately, there are very satisfactory relations, but I am now speaking of the general relationship which exists between capital and labour. Everywhere there is dissatisfaction, with it much more acute on the other side of the water than on this side, and one of the things that have to be brought about for mankind can be brought about by what we do in this country, because, as a matter of fact, if I may refer for a moment to the treaty of peace, there is a part of that treaty which sets up an international method of consultation about the conditions of labour. It is a splendid instrument locked up in that great document. I have called it frequently the Magna Charta of labour, for it is that, and the standards set up, for standards are stated, are the standards of American labour so far as they could be adopted in a general conference. The point I wish to make is that the world is looking to America to set the standards with regard to the conditions of labour and the relations between labour and capital, and it is looking to us because we have been more progressive than other nations in those matters, though sometimes we have moved very slowly and with undue caution. As a result of our progressiveness the ruling influences among our working men are conservative in the sense that they see that it is not in the interest of labour to break up civilization,

and progressive in the sense that they see that a constructive program has to be adopted. By a progressive I do not mean a man who is ready to move, but a man who knows where he is going when he moves. A man who has got a workable program is the only progressive, because if you have not got a workable program you can not make it good and you can not progress. Very well, then, we have got to have a constructive program with regard to labour, and the minute we get it we will relieve the strain all over the world, because the world will accept our standards and follow our example. I am not dogmatic about this matter. I can not presume that I know how it ought to be done. I know the principle upon which it ought to be done. The principle is that the interests of capital and the interests of labour are not different but the same, and men of business sense ought to know how to work out an organization which will express that identity of interest. Where there is identity of interest there must be community of interest. You can not any longer regard labor as a commodity. You have got to regard it as a means of association, the association of physical skill and physical vigor with the enterprise which is managed by those who represent capital; and when you do, the production of the world is going to go forward by leaps and bounds.

Why is it that labour organizations jealously limit the amount of work that their men can do? Because they are driving hard bargains with you; they do not feel that they are your partners at all, and so long as labour and capital are antagonistic production is going to be at its minimum. Just so soon as they are sympathetic and cooperative it is going to abound, and that will be one of the means of bringing down the cost of living. In other words, my fellow citizens, we can do something, we can do a great deal, along the lines of your governor's recommendation and along the lines that I took the liberty of recommending to the Congress of the United States, but we must remember that we

are only beginning the push, that we are only learning the job, and that its ramifications extend into all the relationships of international credit and international industry. We ought to give our thought to this, gentlemen: America, though we do not like to admit it, has been very provincial in regard to the world's business. When we had to engage in banking transactions outside the United States we generally did it through English bankers or, more often, through German bankers. You did not find American banks in Shanghai and Calcutta and all around the circle of the world. You found every other bank there; you found French banks and English banks and German banks and Swedish banks. You did not find American banks. American bankers have not, as a rule, handled international exchange, and here all of a sudden, as if by the turn of the hand, because of the sweeping winds of this war which have destroyed so many things, we are called upon to handle the bulk of international exchange: We have got to learn it, and we have got to learn it fast. We have got to have American instrumentalities in every part of the world if American money is going to rehabilitate the world, as American money must.

If you say, "Why should we rehabilitate the world?" I will not suggest any altruistic motive; but if you want to trade you have got to have somebody to trade with. If you want to carry your business to the ends of the world, there must be business at the ends of the world to tie in with. And if the business of the world lags your industries lag and your prosperity lags. We have no choice but to be the servants of the world if we would be our own servants. I do not like to put it on that ground because that is not the American ground. America is ready to help the world, whether it benefits her or not. She did not come into the world, she was not created by the great men who set her Government up, in order to make money out of the rest of mankind. She was set up in order to rehabilitate the rest

of mankind, and the dollar of American money spent to free those who have been enslaved is worth more than a million dollars put in any American pocket.

It is in this impersonal way that I am trying to illustrate to you how the problem that we are facing in the high cost of living is the end and the beginning and a portion of a world problem, and the great difficulty, just now, my fellow citizens, is in getting some minds adjusted to the world. One of the difficulties that are being encountered about the treaty and the League of Nations, if I may be permitted to say so —and perhaps I can say so the more freely here because I do not think this difficulty exists in the mind of either Senator from this State—the difficulty is, not prejudice so much but that thing which is so common and so inconvenient —just downright ignorance. Ignorance, I mean, of the state of the world and of America's relation to the state of the world. We can not change that relation. It is a fact. It is a fact bigger than anybody of us, and one of the advantages that the United States has it ought not to forfeit; it is made up out of all the thinking peoples of the world. We do not draw our blood from any one source; we do not draw our principles from any one nation; we are made up out of all the sturdy stocks of the round world. We have gotten uneasy because some other kinds of stocks tried to come in; but the bulk remains the same; we are made up out of the hard-headed, hard-fisted, practical and yet idealistic, and forward-looking peoples of the world, and we of all people ought to have an international understanding, an ability to comprehend what the problem of the world is and what part we ought to play in that problem. We have got to play a part, and we can play it either as members of the board of directors or as outside speculators. We can play it inside or on the curb, and you know how inconvenient it is to play it on the curb.

It has been a privilege, gentlemen, to be permitted in this informal way to disclose to you some part of the thought

which I am carrying about with me as really a great burden, because I have seen the disturbed world on the other side of the water. I know the earnest hope and beautiful confidence with which they are looking toward us, and my heart is full of the burden of it. It is a great responsibility for us to carry. We will have to have infinite intelligence and infinite diligence in business to fulfill the expectations of the peoples of the world; and yet that is our duty, our inescapable duty, and we must concert together to perform it.

Address at Minneapolis, Minn.

September 9, 1919

Your Honor, Your Excellency, My Fellow Countrymen:

I have come here to discuss a very solemn question, and I shall have to ask your patience while you bear with me in discussing somewhat in detail the very great matter which now lies not only before the consideration of the people of the United States but before the consideration of the people of the world. You have heard so many little things about the treaty that perhaps you would like to hear some big things about it. To hear some gentlemen you would think it was an arrangement for the inconvenience of the United States, whereas, as a matter of fact, my fellow citizens, it is a world settlement, the first ever attempted, attempted upon broad lines which were first laid down in America. For, my fellow citizens, what does not seem to me realized in this blessed country of ours is the fact that the world is in revolution. I do not mean in active revolution. I do not mean that it is in a state of mind which will bring about the dissolution of governments. I mean that it is in a state of mind which may bring about the dissolution of governments if we do not enter into a world settlement which will really in fact and in power establish justice and right.

The old order of things the rest of the world seemed to have got in some sense used to. The old order of things was not to depend upon the general moral judgment of mankind, not to base policies upon international right, but to base policies upon international power. So there were drawn together groups of nations which stood armed, facing one another, which stood drawing their power from the vitality of people who did not wish to be subordinated to them, drawing their vitality from the energy of great peoples who did not wish to devote their energy to force, but wished to devote their energy to peace. The world thought it was inevitable. This group of nations thought that it represented one set of principles; that group of nations though that it represented another set of principles and that the best that could be accomplished in the world was this that they used to call the balance of power.

Notice the phrase. Not the balance that you try to maintain in a court of justice, not the scales of justice, but the scales of force; one great force balanced against another force. Every bit of the policy of the world, internationally speaking, was made in the interest of some national advantage on the part of the stronger nations of the world. It was either the advantage of Germany or the advantage of Great Britain or the advantage of Italy or the advantage of Japan. I am glad to say that I am not justified in adding that the policy of the world was ever conceived by us upon the basis of the advantage of America. We wished always to be the mediators of justice and of right, but we thought that the cool spaces of the ocean to the east and the west of us would keep us from the infections that came, arising like miasmatic mists out of that arrangement of power and of suspicion and of dread.

I believe, my fellow countrymen, that the only people in Europe who instinctively realized what was going to happen and what did happen in 1914 was the French

people. It has been my privilege to come into somewhat intimate contact with that interesting and delightful people, and I realize now that for nearly fifty years, ever since the settlement which took Alsace-Lorraine away from them in 1871, they have been living under the constant dread of the catastrophe which at last came; and their thought throughout this conference was that they must concert some measure, must draw together some kind of cooperative force, which would take this intolerable dread from their hearts, that they could not live another fifty years, expecting what would come at last. But the other nations took it lightly. There were wise men in Great Britain, there were wise men in the United States, who pointed out to us not only what they suspected, but what we all knew with regard to the preparations for the use of force in Europe. Nobody was ignorant of what Germany was doing. What we shut our eyes against deliberately was the probability that she would make the use of her preparation that she did finally make of it. Her military men published books and told us what they were going to do with it, but we dismissed them. We said, "The thing is a nightmare. The man is a crank. It can not be that he speaks for a great Government. The thing is inconceivable and can not happen." Very well, could not it happen? Did not it happen? Are we satisfied now what the balance of power means? It means that the stronger force will sometimes be exercised or an attempt be made to exercise it to crush the other powers.

The great nations of the world have been asleep, but God knows the other nations have not been asleep. I have seen representatives of peoples over there who for generations through, in the dumbness of unutterable suffering, have known what the weight of those armaments and the weight of that power meant. The great Slavic people, the great Roumanian people, the people who were constantly under the pressure of that power, the great Polish people—they all knew, but they were inarticulate; there was no place in

the world where they dared speak out. Now the catastrophe has come. Blood has been spilt in rivers, the flower of the European nations has been destroyed, and at last the voiceless multitudes of men are awake, and they have made up their minds that rather than have this happen again, if the governments can not get together, they will destroy the governments.

I am not speaking revolution, my friends. I believe that the most disastrous thing that can happen to the underman, to the man who is suffering, to the man who has not had his rights, is to destroy public order, for that makes it certain he never can get his rights. I am far from intimating that, but I am intimating this, that the people of the world are tired of every other kind of experiment except the one we are going to try. I have called it an experiment; I frankly admit that it is an experiment, but it is a very promising experiment, because there is not a statesman in the world who does not know that his people demand it. He is not going to change his mind. He is not going to change his direction. He is not speaking what he wants, it may be, but he is speaking what he knows he must speak, and that there is no turning back; that the world has turned a corner that it will never turn again. The old order is gone, and nobody can build it up again.

In the meantime what are men doing? I want you to reflect upon this, my fellow countrymen, because this is not a speech-making occasion; this is a conference. I want you men to reflect upon what I am about to call your attention to. The object of the war was to destroy autocratic power; that is to say, to make it impossible that there should be anywhere, as there was on Wilhelmstrasse, in Berlin, a little group of military men who could brush aside the bankers, brush aside the merchants, brush aside the manufacturers, brush aside the Emperor himself, and say, "We have perfected a machine with which we can conquer the world; now stand out of the way, we are going to conquer the

world." There must not be that possibility any more. There must not be men anywhere in any private place who can plot the mastery of civilization. But in the meantime look at the pitiful things that are happening. There is not a day goes by, my fellow citizens, that my heart is not heavy to think of our fellow beings in that great, pitiful kingdom of Russia, without form, without order, without government. Look what they have done. They have permitted a little handful of men—I am told there are only thirty-four of them constituting the real Bolshevist government—to set up a minority government just as autocratic and just as cruelly unmerciful as the government of the Czar ever was. The danger to the world, my fellow citizens, against which we must absolutely lock the door in this country, is that some governments of minorities may be set up here as elsewhere. We will brook the control of no minority in the United States. For my own part, I would as leave live under one autocracy as another; I would as leave obey one group as another; I would as leave be the servant of one minority as another, but I do not intend to be the servant of any minority. As I have told you, the mass of men are awake. They are not going to let the world sink back into that old slough of misused authority again.

Very well, then, what are we discussing? What are we debating in the United States? Whether we will take part in guiding and steadying the world or not. And some men hesitate. It is the only country in the world whose leadership and guidance will be accepted. If we do not give it, we may look forward, my fellow citizens, to something like a generation of doubt and of disorder which it will be impossible to pass through without the wreckage of a very considerable part of our slowly constructed civilization. America and her determinations now constitute the balance of moral force in the world, and if we do not use that moral force we will be of all peoples the most derelict. We are in

the presence of this great choice, in the presence of this fundamental choice, whether we will stand by the mass of our own people and the mass of mankind. Pick up the great volume of the treaty. It is a great volume. It is as thick as that [illustrating]. You would think it just had three or four articles in it to hear some men talk about it. It is a thick volume, containing the charter of the new order of the world. I took the pains to write down here some of the things that it provides for, and if you will be patient I will read them, because I can make it more brief that way.

It provides for the destruction of autocratic power as an instrument of international control, admitting only self-governing nations to the League of Nations. Had you ever been told that before? No nation is admitted to the League of Nations whose people do not control its government. That is the reason that we are making Germany wait. She says that henceforth her people are going to control her Government, but we have got to wait and see. If they do control it, she is as welcome to the League as anybody else, because we are not holding nations off. We are holding selfish groups of men off. We are not saying to peoples, "We do not want to be your comrades and serve you along with the rest of our fellow beings," but we are saying, "It depends upon your attitude: if you take charge of your own affairs, then come into the game and welcome." The League of Nations sends autocratic governments to Coventry. That is the first point.

It provides for the substitution of publicity, discussion and arbitration for war. That is the supreme thing that it does. I will not go into details now, but every member of the League promises not to go to war until there has been a discussion and a cooling off of nine months, and, as I have frequently said on this tour, if Germany had submitted to discussion for nine days she never would have dared go to war. Though every foreign office in Europe begged her to do so, she would not grant twenty-four hours for a meeting

of the representatives of the Governments of the world to ask what it was all about, because she did not dare tell what it was all about. Nine months' cooling off is a very valuable institution in the affairs of mankind. And you have got to have a very good case if you are willing that all your fellow men should know the whole case, for that is provided for, and talk about it for nine months. Nothing is more valuable, if you think your friend is a fool, than to induce him to hire a hall. If you think he is a fool the only way to prove it is to let him address a mass of his fellow citizens and see how they like his ideas. If they like them and you do not, it may be that you are the fools! The proof is presented at any rate.

Instead of using force after this period of discussion, something very much more effective than force is proposed, namely, an absolute boycott of the nation that does not keep its covenant, and when I say an absolute boycott I mean an absolute boycott. There can not be any kind of intercourse with that nation. It can not sell or buy goods. It can not receive or send messages or letters. It can not have any transactions with the citizens of any member of the League, and when you consider that the League is going to consist of every considerable nation in the world, except Germany, you can see what that boycott will mean. There is not a nation in the world, except this one, that can live without importing goods for nine months, and it does not make any difference to us whether we can or not, because we always fulfill our obligations, and there will never be a boycott for us.

It provides for placing the peace of the world under constant international oversight, in recognition of the principle that the peace of the world is the legitimate and immediate interest of every nation. Why, as it stands at present, my fellow citizens, if there is likely to be trouble between two nations other than the United States it is considered an unfriendly and hostile act for the United States

to intervene. This covenant makes it the right of the United States, and not the right of the United States merely, but the right of the weakest nation in the world to bring anything that the most powerful nation in the world is doing that is likely to disturb the peace of the world under the scrutiny of mankind.

It provides for disarmament on the part of the great fighting nations of the world.

It provides in detail for the rehabilitation of oppressed peoples, and that will remove most of the causes of war.

It provides that there shall be no more annexations of territory anywhere, but that those territories whose people are not ready to govern themselves shall be intrusted to the trusteeship of the nations that can take care of them, the trustee nation to be responsible in annual reports to the League of Nations; that is to say, to mankind in general, subject to removal and restricted in respect to anything that might be done to that population which would be to the detriment of the population itself. So that you can not go into darkest Africa and make slaves of those poor people, as some governments at times have done.

It abolishes enforced labour. It takes the same care of the women and children of those unschooled races that we try to take of the women and children of ours. Why, my fellow citizens, this is the great humane document of all time.

It provides that every secret treaty shall be invalid. It sweeps the table of all private understandings and enforces the principle that there shall be no private understandings of any kind that anybody is bound to respect. One of the difficulties in framing this treaty was that after we got over there private—secret—treaties were springing up on all sides like a noxious growth. You had to guard your breathing apparatus against the miasma that arose from some of them. But they were treaties, and the war had been fought on the principle of the sacredness of treaties. We could

not propose that solemn obligations, however unwisely undertaken, should be disregarded, but we could do the best that was possible in the presence of those understandings and then say, "No more of this; no more secret understandings." And the representatives of every great nation in the world assented without demur—without the slightest difficulty.

I do not think you realize what a change of mind has come over the world. As we used to say in the old days, some men that never got it before have got religion.

It provides for the protection of dependent peoples.

It provides that high standards of labour, such as are observed in the United States, shall be extended to the workingman everywhere in the world.

It provides that all the great humane instrumentalities, like the Red Cross, like the conventions against the opium trade, like the regulation of the liquor traffic with debased and ignorant people, like the prohibition of the selling of arms and ammunition to people who can use them only to their own detriment, shall be under the common direction and control of the League of Nations. Now, did you ever hear of all these things before? That is the treaty, my fellow citizens; and I can only conjecture that some of the men who are fighting the treaty either never read it themselves or are taking it for granted that you will not read it. I say without hesitation that no international agreement has ever before been drawn up along those lines—of the universal consideration of right and the interest of humanity.

Now, it is said that that is all very well, but we need not go in. Well, of course we need not. There is perfect freedom of the will. I am perfectly free to go to the top of this building and jump off, but if I do I will not take very much interest in human affairs. The nation is at liberty in one sense to do anything it pleases to discredit itself; but this is absolutely as certain as I stand here, that it never will

do anything to discredit itself. Our choice in this great enterprise of mankind that I have tried to outline to you is only this: Shall we go in and assist as trusted partners or shall we stay out and act as suspected rivals? We have got to do one or the other. We have got to be either provincials or statesmen. We have got to be either ostriches or eagles. The ostrich act I see being done all around me. I see gentlemen burying their heads in something and thinking that nobody sees that they have submerged their thinking apparatus. That is what I mean by being ostriches. What I mean by being eagles I need not describe to you. I mean leaving the mists that lie close along the ground, getting upon strong wing into those upper spaces of the air where you can see with clear eyes the affairs of mankind, see how the affairs of America are linked with the affairs of men everywhere, see how the whole world turns with outstretched hands to this blessed country of ours and says, "If you will lead, we will follow." God helping us, my fellow countrymen, we will lead when they follow. The march is still long and toilsome to those heights upon which there rests nothing but the pure light of the justice of God, but the whole incline of affairs is toward those distant heights; and this great nation, in serried ranks, millions strong—presently hundreds of millions strong—will march at the fore of the great procession, breasting those heights with its eyes always lifted to the eternal goal!

ADDRESS AT AUDITORIUM, ST. PAUL, MINN.
SEPTEMBER 9, 1919

Mr. Chairman, My Fellow Countrymen:

The theme that I find uppermost in my thought tonight is this: We are all actuated by an intense consciousness and love of America. I do not think that it is fancy on my part; it is based upon long experience that in every part of the

world I can recognize an American the minute I see him. Yet that is not because we are all of one stock. We are of more varied origins and stocks than any people in the world. We come from all the great races of the world. We are made up out of all the nations and peoples who have stood at the center of civilization. In this part of the country it is doubtful whether in some of our great cities 50 per cent. of the people come of parents born in America.

I do not know how it happens that we are all Americans; we are so different in origin; we are so different in memories. The memory of America does not go very far back as measured by the distances of history, and great millions of our people carry in their hearts the traditions of other people, the traditions of races never bred in America; yet we are all unmistakably and even in appearance Americans, and nothing else. There is only one possible explanation for that, my fellow citizens, and that is that there is in the practice and in the tradition of this country a set of principles which, however imperfectly, get into the consciousness of every man who lives in this country.

One of the chief elements that make an American is this: In almost every other country there is some class that dominates, or some governmental authority that determines the course of politics, or some ancient system of land laws that limits the freedom of land tenure, or some ancient custom which ties a man into a particular groove in the land in which he lives. There is none of that in America. Every man in America, if he behaves himself, knows that he stands on the same footing as every other man in America, and, thank goodness, we are in sight of the time when every woman will know that she stands upon the same footing. We do not have to ask anybody's leave what we shall think or what we shall do or how we shall vote. We do not have to get the approval of a class as to our behavior. We do not have to square ourselves with standards that have been followed ever since our great-grandfathers. We are very

much more interested in being great-grandfathers than in having had great-grandfathers, because our view is to the future. America does not march, as so many other peoples march, looking back over its shoulder. It marches with its eyes not only forward, but with its eyes lifted to the distances of history, to the great events which are slowly culminating, in the Providence of God, in the lifting of civilization to new levels and new achievements. That is what makes us Americans.

And yet I was mistaken a moment ago when I said we are nothing else, because there are a great many hyphens left in America. For my part, I think the most un-American thing in the world is a hyphen. I do not care what it is that comes before the word "American." It may be a German-American, or an Italian-American, a Swedish-American, or an Anglo-American, or an Irish-American. It does not make any difference what comes before the "American," it ought not to be there, and every man who comes to take counsel with me with a hyphen in his conversation I take no interest in whatever. The entrance examination, to use my own parlance, into my confidence is, "Where do you put America in your thoughts? Do you put it first, always first, unquestionably first?" Then we can sit down together and talk, but not otherwise. Now, I want you distinctly to understand that I am not quarreling with the affectionate memories of people who have drawn their origin from other countries. I no more blame a man for dwelling with fond affection upon the traditions of some great race not bred in America than I blame a man for remembering with reverence his mother and his father and his forbears that bred him and that gave him a chance in the world. I am not quarreling with those affections; I am talking about purposes. Every purpose is for the future, and the future for Americans must be for America.

We have got to choose now, my fellow citizens, what kind of future it is going to be for America. I think that what I

have said justifies me in adding that this nation was created to be the mediator of peace, because it draws its blood from every civilized stock in the world and is ready by sympathy and understanding to understand the peoples of the world, their interests, their rights, their hopes, their destiny. America is the only nation in the world that has that equipment. Every other nation is set in the mold of a particular breeding. We are set in no mold at all. Every other nation has certain prepossessions which run back through all the ramifications of an ancient history. We have nothing of the kind. We know what all peoples are thinking, and yet we by a fine alchemy of our own combine that thinking into an American plan and an American purpose. America is the only nation which can sympathetically lead the world in organizing peace.

Constantly, when I was on the other side of the water, delegations representing this, that, and the other peoples of Europe or of Asia came to visit me to solicit the interest of America in their fortunes, and, without exception, they were able to tell me that they had kinsmen in America. Some of them, I am ashamed to say, came from countries I had never heard of before, and yet even they were able to point, not to a handful, not to a few hundreds, but to several thousand kinsmen in America. I never before knew that they came, but they are here and they are our interpreters, the interpreters on our behalf of the interests of the people from whom they sprang. They came to America as sort of advanced couriers of those people. They came in search of the Golden West. They came in search of the liberty that they understood reigned among that free and happy people. They were drawn by the lure of justice, by the lure of freedom, out of lands where they were oppressed, suppressed, where life was made impossible for them upon the free plane that their hearts had conceived. They said, "Yonder is our star in the west," and then the word went home, "We have found the land. They are a free people that are ca-

pable of understanding us. You go to their representatives in Paris and put your case before them, and they will understand." What a splendid thing that is, my fellow countrymen! I want you to keep this is in your minds as a conception of the question that we are now called upon to decide.

To hear some men talk about the League of Nations you would suppose that it was a trap set for America; you would suppose that it was an arrangement by which we entered into an alliance with other great, powerful nations to make war some time. Why, my fellow countrymen, it bears no resemblance to such description. It is a great method of common counsel with regard to the common interests of mankind. We shall not be drawn into wars; we shall be drawn into consultation, and we will be the most trusted adviser in the whole group. Consultation, discussion, is written all over the whole face of the covenant of the League of Nations, for the heart of it is that the nations promise not to go to war until they have consulted, until they have discussed, until all the facts in the controversy have been laid before the court which represents the common opinion of mankind.

That is the League of Nations. Nothing can be discussed there that concerns our domestic affairs. Nothing can be discussed there that concerns the domestic affairs of any other people, unless something is occurring in some nation which is likely to disturb the peace of the world, and any time that any question arises which is likely to disturb the peace of the world, then the covenant makes it the right of any member, strong or weak, big or little, of that universal concert of the nations to bring that matter up for clarification and discussion. Can you imagine anything more calculated to put war off, not only to put it off, but to make it violently improbable? When a man wants to fight he does not go and discuss the matter with the other fellow. He goes and hits him, and then somebody else has to come in and

either join the fight or break it up. I used a very homely illustration the other night, which perhaps it may not be amiss for me to use again. I had two friends who were becoming more and more habitually profane. Their friends did not like it. They not only had the fundamental scruple that it was wrong, but they also thought, as I heard a very refined lady say, "It was not only wrong but, what was worse, it was vulgar." They did not like to see their friends adjourning all the rest of their vocabulary and using only those words. So they made them enter into a solemn agreement—I ought to say they lived in a large city—that they would not swear inside the corporate limits; that if they got in a state of mind which made it necessary to explode in profanity they would get out of town and swear.

The first time the passion came upon them and they recalled their promise they got sheepishly on a street car and made for the town limits, and I need hardly tell you that when they got there they no longer wanted to swear. They had cooled off. The long spaces of the town, the people going about their ordinary business, nobody paying any attention to them, the world seeming to be at peace when they were at war, all brought them to a realization of the smallness of the whole business, and they turned around and came into town again. Comparing great things with small, that will suffice as a picture of the advantage of discussion in international matters as well as in individual matters, because it was universally agreed on the other side of the water that if Germany had allowed the other Governments to confer with her twenty-four hours about the recent war, it could not have taken place. We know why. It was an unconscionable war. She did not dare discuss it. You can not afford to discuss a thing when you are in the wrong, and the minute you feel that the whole judgment of the world is against you, you have a different temper in affairs altogether.

This is a great process of discussion that we are entering

into, and my point tonight—it is the point I want to leave with you—is that we are the people of all people in the world intelligently to discuss the difficulties of the nations which we represent, although we are Americans. We are the predestined mediators of mankind. I am not saying this in any kind of national pride or vanity. I believe that is mere historic truth, and I try to interpret circumstances in some intelligent way. If that is the kind of people we are, it must have been intended that we should make some use of the opportunities and powers that we have, and when I hear gentlemen saying that we must keep out of this thing and take care of ourselves I think to myself, "Take care of ourselves? Where did we come from? Is there nobody else in the world to take care of? Have we no sympathies that do not run out into the great field of human experience everywhere? Is that what America is, with her mixture of bloods?" Why, my fellow citizens, that is a fundamental misconception of what it is to be an American, and these gentlemen are doing a harm which they do not realize. I want to testify to you here to-night, my fellow citizens, because I have the means of information, that since it has seemed to be uncertain whether we are going to play this part of leadership in the world or not, this part of leadership in accommodation, the old intrigues have stirred up in this country again. That intrigue which we universally condemn—that hyphen which looked to us like a snake, the hyphen between "German" and "American"—has reared its head again, and you hear the "his-s-s" of its purpose. What is that purpose? It is to keep America out of the concert of nations, in order that America and Germany, being out of that concert, may stand—in their mistaken dream—united to dominate the world, or, at any rate, the one assist the other in holding the nations of the world off while its ambitions are realized.

There is no conjecture about this, my fellow citizens. We know the former purposes of German intrigue in this coun-

try, and they are being revived. Why? We have not reduced very materially the number of the German people. Germany remains the great power of central Europe. She has more than 60,000,000 people now (she had nearly 70,000,000 before Poland and other provinces were taken away). You can not change the temper and expectations of a people by five years of war, particularly five years of war in which they are not yet conscious of the wrong they did or of the wrong way in which they did it. They are expecting the time of the revival of their power, and along with the revival of their power goes their extraordinary capacity, their unparalleled education, their great capacity in commerce and finance and manufacture. The German bankers and the German merchants and the German manufacturers did not want this war. They were making conquest of the world without it, and they knew it would spoil their plans, not advance then; and it has spoiled their plans, but they are there yet with their capacity, with their conception of what it is to serve the world materially and so subdue the world psychologically. All of that is still there, my fellow countrymen, and if America stays out then the rest of the world will have to watch Germany and watch America, and when there are two dissociated powers there is danger that they will have the same purposes.

There can be only one intelligent reason for America staying out of this, and that is that she does not want peace, that she wants war sometimes and the advantage which war will bring her, and I want to say now and here that the men who think that by that thought they are interpreting America are making the sort of mistake upon which it will be useful for them to reflect in obscurity for the rest of their lives. This is a peaceful people. This is a liberty-loving people, and liberty is suffocated by war. Free institutions can not survive the strain of prolonged military administration. In order to live tolerable lives you must lift the fear of war and the practice of war from the lives

of nations. America is evidence of the fact that no great democracy ever entered upon an aggressive international policy. I want you to know, if you will be kind enough to read the covenant of the League of Nations—most of the people that are arguing against it are taking it for granted that you have never read it—take the pains to read it, and you will find that no nation is admitted to the League of Nations that can not show that it has the institutions which we call free. Nobody is admitted except the self-governing nations, because it was the instinctive judgment of every man who sat around that board that only a nation whose government was its servant and not its master could be trusted to preserve the peace of the world. There are not going to be many other kinds of nations long, my fellow citizens. The people of this world—not merely the people of America, for they did the job long ago—have determined that there shall be no more autocratic governments.

And in their haste to get rid of one of them they set up another. I mean in pitiful Russia. I wish we could learn the lesson of Russia so that it would be burned into the consciousness of every man and woman in America. That lesson is that nobody can be free where there is not public order and authority. What has happened in Russia is that an old and distinguished and skillful autocracy has had put in its place an amateur autocracy, a little handful of men exercising without the slightest compunction of mercy or pity the bloody terror that characterized the worst days of the Czar. That is what must happen if you knock things to pieces. Liberty is a thing of slow construction. Liberty is a thing of universal cooperation. Liberty is a thing which you must build up by habit. Liberty is a thing which is rooted and grounded in character, and the reason I am so certain that the leadership of the world, in respect of order and progress, belongs to America is that I know that these principles are rooted and grounded in the American character. It is not our intellectual capacity, my fellow

citizens, that has given us our place in the world, though I rate that as high as the intellectual capacity of any other people that ever lived, but it is the heart that lies back of the man that makes America. Ask this question of yourselves. I have no doubt that this room is full of mothers and fathers and wives and sweethearts who sent their beloved young men to France. What did you send them there for? What made you proud that they were going? What made you willing that they should go? Did you think they were seeking to aggrandize America in some way? Did you think they were going to take something for America that had belonged to somebody else? Did you think that they were going in a quarrel which they had provoked and must maintain? The question answers itself. You were proud that they should go because they were going on an errand of self-sacrifice, in the interest of mankind. What a halo and glory surround those old men whom we now greet with such reverence, the men who were the soldiers in our Civil War! They saved a nation. Ah, when these youngsters grow old who have come back from the fields of France, what a halo will be around their brows! They saved the world. They are of the same stuff as those old veterans of the Civil War. Mind you, I was born and bred in the South, but I can pay that tribute with all my heart to the men who saved the Union. It ought to have been saved. It was the greatest thing that men had conceived up to that time. Now we come to a greater thing—to the union of great nations in conference upon the interests of peace. That is the fruitage, the fine and appropriate fruitage, of what these men achieved upon the fields of France.

This was a war to make similar wars impossible, and merely to win this war and stop at that is to make it certain that we shall have to fight another and a final one. I hear opponents of the League of Nations say, "But this does not guarantee peace." No; nothing guarantees us against human passion and error, but I would like to put this business

proposition to you: If it increases the probability of peace by, let us say, 10 per cent., do you not think it is worth while? In my judgment, it increases it about 99 per cent. Henceforth the genius of the world will be devoted to accommodating the counsels of mankind and not confusing them; not supplying heat but supplying light; not putting friction into the machine, but easing the friction off and combining the parts of the great machinery of civilization so that they will run in smooth harmony and perfection. My fellow citizens, the tasks of peace that are ahead of us are the most difficult tasks to which the human genius has ever been devoted. I will state the fundamental task, for it is the fundamental task. It is the relationship between those who toil with their hands and those who direct that toil. I will not say the relationship between capital and labour; that means something slightly different. I say the relationship between those who organize enterprise and those who make enterprise go by the skill and labour of their hands. There is at present, to say the least, a most unsatisfactory relationship between those two and we must devote our national genius to working out a method of association between the two which will make this Nation the nation to solve triumphantly and for all time the fundamental problem of peaceful production. You ask, "What has that got to do with the League of Nations?" I dare say that you do not know because I have never heard anybody tell you that the great charter, the new international charter, of labour is in the treaty of peace and associated with the League of Nations. A great machinery of consultation is set up there, not merely about international political affairs, but about standards of labour, about the relationships between managers and employees, about the standards of life and the conditions of labour, about the labour of women and of children, about the humane side and the business side of the whole labour problem. And the first conference is going to sit in Washington next month; not

the conference which some of you may have heard of, which I have just called of our own people, but an international conference to consider the interests of labour all over the round world. I do not know—nobody knows—whether the Senate will have stopped debating by that time or not. I heard a Member of the Senate say that nobody knew that except God Almighty! But whether it has finished or not, the conference is going to sit, and if it has not finished, the only question that will be left unsettled is whether we are going to sit inside of it or outside of it. The conference at Paris voted, in their confidence in the American people, that the first meeting should be held in Washington and should be called by the President of the United States. They supposed in their innocence that the President of the United States represented the people of the United States. And in calling this conference, as I have called it, I am confident that I am representing the people of the United States. After I have bidden the delegates welcome, perhaps I can have a chair just outside the door and listen.

I am jesting, my fellow citizens, but there is a little sadness in the jest. Why do we wait to do a great thing? Why do we wait to fulfill the destiny of America? Why do we make it possible that anybody should think that we are not coming in now, but are going to wait later and come in with Germany? I suppose there is a certain intellectual excitement and pleasure in debate, but I do not experience any when great issues like this are pending, and I would be very sad, indeed, if I did not have an absolute, unclouded confidence of the result. I had the great good fortune to be born an American, I have saturated myself in the traditions of our country, I have read all the great literature that interprets the spirit of our country, and when I read my own heart with regard to these great purposes, I feel confident that it is a sample American heart. Therefore I have the most unbounded confidence in the result. All that is needed is that you should be vocal and audible. I know

what you want. Say it and get it. I am your servant; all the men elected to go to Washington are your servants. It is not our privilege to follow our private convictions; it is our duty to represent your convictions and execute your purposes, and therefore all that is needed is a consciousness. Tell me that you do not want to do what I am urging and I will go home; but tell me, as your faces and your voices tell me, that you do want what I want, and I will be heartened for the rest of my journey, and I will say to the folks all the way from here to the Pacific, "Minnesota is up and on her tiptoes and behind you. Let's all of us get in the great team which is to redeem the destinies of mankind."

Shall we have our treaty, or shall we have somebody else's? Shall we keep the primacy of the world, or shall we abandon it?

Address at Bismarck, No. Dak.

September 10, 1919

Governor Frazier, My Fellow Countrymen:

I esteem it a great privilege to stand in your presence and to continue the discussion that I have been attempting in other parts of the country of the great matter which is pending for our determination. I say that it is pending for our determination, because, after all, it is a question for the thoughtful men and women of the United States. I believe that the gentlemen at Washington are trying to assess the opinion of the United States and are trying to embody and express it.

It seems very strange from day to day as I go about that I should be discussing the question of peace. It seems very strange that after six months of conference in Paris, where the minds of more than twenty nations were brought to-

gether and where, after the most profound consideration of every question and every angle of every question concerned, an extraordinary agreement should have been reached—that while every other country concerned has stopped debating the peace, America is debating it. It seems very strange to me, my fellow countrymen, because, as a matter of fact, we are debating the question of peace or war. There is only one way to have peace, and that is to have it by the concurrence of the minds of the world. America can not bring about peace by herself. No other nation can bring about peace by itself. The agreement of a small group of nations can not bring about peace. The world is not at peace. It is not, except in certain disturbed quarters, actually using military means of war, but the mind of the world is not at peace. The mind of the world is waiting for the verdict, and the verdict they are waiting for is this, Shall we have in the future the same dangers, the same suspicions, the same distractions, and shall we expect that out of those dangers and distractions armed conflict will arise? Or shall we expect that the world will be willing to sit down at the council table to talk the thing over; to delay all use of force until the world has had time to express its judgment upon the matter at issue? If that is not to be the solution, if the world is not to substitute discussion and arbitration for war, then the world is not now in a state of mind to have peace, even for the time being. While victory has been won, my fellow countrymen, it has been won only over the force of a particular group of nations. It has not been won over the passions of those nations, or over the passions of the nations that were set against them. This treaty which I brought back with me is a great world settlement, and it tries to deal with some of the elements of passion which were likely at any time to blaze out in the world and which did blaze out and set the world on fire.

The trouble was at the heart of Europe. At the heart

of Europe there were suffering peoples, inarticulate but with hearts on fire against the iniquities practiced against them; held in the grip of military power and submitting to nothing but force; their spirits insurgent; and so long as that continued, there could not be the expectation of continued peace. This great settlement at Paris for the first time in the world considered the cry of the peoples and did not listen to the plea of governments. It did not listen to dynastic claims. It did not read over the whole story of rival territorial ambitions. It said, "The day is closed for that. These lands belong to the stocks, the ancient stocks of people that live upon them, and we are going to give them to those people and say to them, 'The land always should have been yours; it is now yours, and you can govern it as you please.' " That is the principle that is at the heart of this treaty, but if that principle can not be maintained then there will ensue upon it the passion that dwelt in the hearts of those peoples, a despair which will bring about universal chaos. Men in despair do not construct governments. Men in despair destroy governments.

We have managed in the process of civilization, my fellow citizens, to make a world that can not be taken to pieces. The pieces are dovetailed and intimately fitted with one another, and unless you assemble them as you do the intimate parts of a great machine, civilization will not work. I believe that, with the exception of the United States, there is not a country in the world that can live without importation. There are only one or two countries that can live without imported foodstuffs. There are no countries that I know of that can live in their ordinary way without importing manufactured goods or raw materials, raw materials of many kinds. Take that great kingdom, for example, for which I have the most intimate sympathy, the great Kingdom of Italy. There are no raw materials worth mentioning in Italy. There are great factories there, but they have to get all the raw materials that they manufacture from out-

side Italy. There is no coal in Italy, no fuel. They have to get all their coal from outside of Italy, and at the present moment because the world is holding its breath and waiting the great coal fields of Central Europe are not being worked except to about 40 per cent. of their capacity. The coal in Silesia, the coal in Bohemia, is not being shipped out, and industries are checked and chilled and drawn in, and starvation comes nearer, unemployment becomes more and more universal. At this moment there is nothing brought to my attention more often at Washington than the necessity for shipping out our fuel and our raw materials to start the world again. If we do not start the world again, then we check and stop to that extent our own industries and our exportations, of course. You can not disentangle the United States from the rest of the world. If the rest of the world goes bankrupt, the business of the United States is in a way to be ruined. I do not like to put the thing upon this basis, my fellow citizens, because this is not the American basis. America was not founded to make money; it was founded to lead the world on the way to liberty, and now, while we debate, all the rest of the world is saying, "Why does America hesitate? We want to follow her. We shall not know which way to go unless she leads. We want the direction of her business genius. We want the suggestions of her principles, and she hesitates. She does not know whether she wants to go or not." Oh, yes, she does, my fellow citizens. Men among us do not know whether we want to go in or not, but we know. There is no more danger of America staying out of this great thing than there is of her reversing all the other processes of her history and forgetting all the principles that she has spilt so much precious blood to maintain. But, in the meantime, the delay is injuring the whole world and ourselves, of course, along with the rest, because we are a very big and, in my opinion, an extremely important part of the world.

I have told many times, but I must tell you again, of the experience that I had in Paris. Almost every day of the week that I was not imperatively engaged otherwise I was receiving delegations. Delegations from where? Not merely groups of men from France and other near-by regions, but groups of men from all over the world—as I have several times admitted, from some parts of the world that I never heard the names of before. I do not think they were in geography when I was at school. If they were, I had forgotten them. Did you ever hear of Adjur-Badjan, for example? A very dignified group of fine-looking men came in from Adjur-Badjan. I did not dare ask them where it was, but I looked it up secretely afterwards and found that it was a very prosperous valley region lying south of the Caucasus and that it had a great and ancient civilization. I knew from what these men said to me that they knew what they were talking about, though I did not know anything about their affairs. They knew, about all things else, what America stood for, and they had come to me, figuratively speaking, with outstretched hands and said, "We want the guidance and the help and the advice of America." And they all said that, until my heart grew fearful, and I said to one group of them, "I beg that you will not expect the impossible. America can not do the things that you are asking her to do. We will do the best we can. We will stand as your friends. We will give you every sort of aid that we can give you, but please do not expect the impossible." They believe that America can work miracles merely by being America and asserting the principles of America throughout the globe, and that kind of assertion, my fellow citizens, is the process of peace; and that is the only possible process of peace.

When I say, therefore, that I have come here this morning actually to discuss the question with you whether we shall have peace or war, you may say, "There is no war; the war is over." The fighting is over, but there is not

peace, and there can not be peace without the assistance of America. The assistance of America comes just at the center of the whole thing that was planned in Paris. You have heard some men talk about separating the covenant of the League of Nations from the treaty. I intended to bring a copy of the treaty with me; it is a volume as thick as that, and the very first thing in it is the League of Nations covenant. By common consent that was put first, because by common consent that is the only thing that will make the rest of the volume work. That was not the opinion at the beginning of the conference. There were a great many cynics on that side of the water who smiled indulgently when you spoke hopefully of drawing the nations together in a common consent of action, but before we got through there was not a man who had not as a hard, practical judgment, come to the conclusion that we could not do without it, that you could not make a world settlement without setting up an organization that would see that it was carried out, and that you could not compose the mind of the world unless that settlement included an arrangement by which discussion should be substituted for war.

If the war that we have just had had been preceded by discussion, it never would have happened. Every foreign office in Europe urged through its minister at Berlin that no action should be taken until there should be an international conference and the other governments should learn what if any processes of mediation they might interpose. And Germany did not dare delay it for twenty-four hours. If she had, she never could have begun it. You dare not lay a bad case before mankind. You dare not kill the young men of the world for a dishonest purpose. We have let thousands of our lads go to their death in order to convince, not Germany merely, but any other nation that may have in the back of its thought a similar enterprise, that the world does not mean to permit any iniquity of that sort, and if it had been displayed as an iniquity in open conference for

not less than nine months, as the covenant of the League of Nations provides, it never could have happened.

Your attention is called to certain features of this League —the only features to which your attention ever is called by those who are opposed to it and you are left with the impression that it is an arrangement by which war is just on the hair trigger. You are constantly told about Article X. Now, Article X has no operative force in it unless we vote that it shall operate. I will tell you what Article X is; I think I can repeat it almost verbatim. Under Article X every member of the League undertakes to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and the existing political independence of the other members of the League. So far so good. The second sentence provides that in case of necessity the council of the League shall advise what steps are necessary to carry out the obligations of that promise; that is to say, what force is necessary if any. The council can not give that advice without a unanimous vote. It can not give the advice, therefore, without the affirmative vote of the United States, unless the United States is a party to the controversy in question. Let us see what that means. Do you think the United States is likely to seize somebody else's territory? Do you think the United States is likely to disregard the first sentence of the article? And if she is not likely to begin an aggression of that sort, who is likely to begin it against her? Is Mexico going to invade us and appropriate Texas? Is Canada going to come down with her nine or ten millions and overwhelm the hundred millions of the United States? Who is going to grab territory, and, above all things else, who is going to entertain the idea if the rest of the world has said, "No; we are all pledged to see that you do not do that." But suppose that somebody does attempt to grab our territory or that we do attempt to grab somebody else's territory. Then the war is ours anyhow. Then what difference does it make what advice the council gives? Unless

it is our war we can not be dragged into a war without our own consent. If that is not an open and shut security, I do not know of any. Yet that is Article X.

I do not recognize this covenant when I hear some other men talk about it. I spent hours and hours in the presence of the representatives of thirteen other Governments examining every sentence of it, up and down and crosswise, and trying to keep out of it anything that interfered with the essential sovereignty of any member of the League. I carried over with me in March all the suggestions made by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, and they were all accepted, and yet I come back and find that I do not understand what the document means. I am told that plain sentences which I thought were unmistakable English terms mean something that I never heard of and that nobody else ever intended as a purpose. But whatever you may think of Article X, my fellow citizens, it is the heart of the treaty. You have either got to take it or you have got to throw the world back into that old conquest over land titles, which would upset the State of North Dakota or any other part of the world. Suppose there were no guaranty of any land title in North Dakota! I can fancy how every farmer and every man with a city lot would go armed. He would hire somebody, if he was too sleepy to sit up all night, to see that nobody trespassed and took squatter possession of his unsecured land. We have been trying to do something analagous to that with the territories of Europe; to fix the land titles, and then having fixed them, we have got to have Article X. Under Article X these titles are established, and we all join to guarantee their maintenance. There is no other way to quiet the world, and if the world is not quieted, then America is sooner or later involved in the mêlée. We boast, my fellow citizens—but we sometimes forget—what a powerful nation the United States is. Do you suppose we can ask the other nations of the world to forget that we are out of the arrangement?

Do you suppose that we can stay out of the arrangement without being suspected and intrigued against and hated by all the rest of them? And do you think that is an advantageous basis for international transactions? Any way you take this question you are led straight around to this alternative, either this treaty with this covenant or a disturbed world and certain war. There is no escape from it.

America recalls, I am sure, all the assurances that she has given to the world in the years past. Some of the very men who are now opposing this covenant were the most eloquent advocates of an international concert which would be carried to a point where the exercise of independent sovereignty would be almost estopped. They put it into measures of Congress. For example, in one, I believe the last, Navy appropriation bill, by unanimous vote of the committee, they put in the provision that after the building program had been authorized by Congress the President could cancel it if in the meantime he had been able to induce the other Governments of the world to set up an international tribunal which would settle international difficulties. They actually had the matter so definitely in mind that they authorized the President not to carry out an act of Congress with regard to the building of great ships if he could get an arrangement similar to the arrangement which I have now laid before them, because their instinctive judgment is, my instinctive judgment and yours is, that we have no choice, if we want to stop war, but to take the steps that are necessary to stop war.

If we do not enter into this covenant, what is our situation? Our situation is exactly the situation of Germany herself, except that we are not disarmed and Germany is disarmed. We have joined with the rest of the world to defeat the objects that Germany had in mind. We now do not even sign the treaty, let us suppose, that disarms Germany. She is disarmed, nevertheless, because the other nations will enter into the treaty, and there, planted in her

heart, planted in the heart of those 60,000,000 people, is this sense of isolation; it may be this sense that some day, by gathering force and change of circumstances, they may have another chance, and the only other nation that they can look to is the United States. The United States has repudiated the guaranty. The United States has said, "Yes; we sent 2,000,000 men over there to accomplish this, but we do not like it now that we have accomplished it and we will not guarantee the consequences. We are going to stay in such a situation that some day we may send 2,000,000 more over there. We promised the mothers and fathers and the wives and the sweethearts that these men were fighting so that this thing should not happen again, but we are now to arrange it so that it may happen again." So the two nations that will stand and play a lone hand in the world would be Germany and the United States.

I am not pointing this out to you, my fellow citizens, because I think it is going to happen. I know it is not. I am not in the least troubled about that; but I do want you to share fully with me the thought that I have brought back from Europe. I know what I am talking about when I say that America is the only nation whose guaranty will suffice to substitute discussion for war, and I rejoice in the circumstance. I rejoice that the day has come when America can fulfill her destiny.

It is a noble prospect. It is a noble opportunity. My pulses quicken at the thought of it. I am glad to have lived in a day when America can redeem her pledges to the world, when America can prove that her leadership is the leadership that leads out of these age-long troubles, these age-long miseries into which the world will not sink back, but which without our assistance, it may struggle out of only through a long period of bloody revolution. The peoples of Europe are in a revolutionary frame of mind. They do not believe in the things that have been practiced upon them in the past, and they mean to have new things prac-

ticed. In the meantime they are, some of them, like pitiful Russia, in danger of doing a most extraordinary thing, substituting one kind of autocracy for another. Russia repudiated the Czar, who was cruel at times, and set up her present masters, who are cruel all the time and pity nobody, who seize everybody's property and feed only the soldiers that are fighting for them; and now, according to the papers, they are likely to brand every one of those soldiers so that he may not easily, at any rate, escape their clutches and desert. Branding their servants and making slaves of a great and lovable people! There is no people in the world fuller of the naïve sentiments of good will and of fellowship than the people of Russia, and they are in the grip of a cruel autocracy that dare not, though challenged by every friendly Government in Europe, assemble a constituency; they dare not appeal to the people. They know that their mastery would end the minute the people took charge of their own affairs.

Do not let us expose any of the rest of the world to the necessity of going through any such terrible experience as that, my fellow countrymen. We are at present helpless to assist Russia, because there are no responsible channels through which we can assist her. Our heart goes out to her, but the world is disordered, and while it is disordered —we debate!

Address From Rear Platform, Mandan, No. Dak.

September 10, 1919

I am glad to get out to see the real folks, to feel the touch of their hand, and know, as I have come to know, how the nation stands together in the common purpose to complete what the boys did who carried their guns with them over the sea. We may think that they finished that job, but they will tell you they did not; that unless we see

to it that peace is made secure, they will have the job to do over again, and we in the meantime will rest under a constant apprehension that we may have to sacrifice the flower of our youth again. The whole country has made up its mind that that shall not happen; and presently, after a reasonable time is allowed for unnecessary debate, we will get out of all this period of doubt and unite the whole force and influence of the United States to steady the world in the lines of peace. It will be the proudest thing and finest thing that America ever did. She was born to do these things, and now she is going to do them.

I am very much obliged to you for coming out.

Address at Auditorium, Billings, Mont.

September 11, 1919

Mr. Mayor, Judge Pierson, My Fellow Countrymen:

It is with genuine pleasure that I face this company and realize that I am in the great State of Montana. I have long wanted to visit this great State and come into contact with its free and vigorous population, and I want to thank Judge Pierson for the happy word that he used in speaking of my errand. He said that I had come to consult with you. That is exactly what I have come to do.

We are debating the treaty of peace with Germany and we are making the mistake, I take the liberty of saying, of debating it as if it were an ordinary treaty with some particular country, a treaty which we could ourselves modify without complicating the affairs of the world: whereas, as a matter of fact, this is not merely a treaty with Germany. Matters were drawn into this treaty which affected the peace and happiness of the whole Continent of Europe, and not of the Continent of Europe merely, but of forlorn populations in Africa, of peoples that we hardly know about in

Asia, in the Far East and everywhere the influence of German policy had extended and everywhere that influence had to be corrected, had to be checked, had to be altered. What I want to impress upon you to-day is that it is this treaty or none. It is this treaty because we can have no other.

Consider the circumstances. For the first time in the world some twenty nations sent their most thoughtful and responsible men to consult together at the capital of France to effect a settlement of the affairs of the world, and I want to render my testimony that these gentlemen entered upon their deliberations with great openness of mind. Their discussions were characterized by the utmost candor, and they realize, my fellow citizens, what as a student of history I venture to say no similar body ever acknowledged before, that they were nobody's masters, that they did not have the right to follow the line of any national advantage in determining what the settlements of the peace should be, but that they were the servants of their people and the servants of the people of the world. This settlement, my fellow citizens, is the first international settlement that was intended for the happiness of the average men and women throughout the world. This is indeed and in truth a people's treaty, and it is the first peoples treaty, and I venture to express the opinion that it is not wise for Parliaments or Congresses to attempt to alter it. It is a people's treaty, notwithstanding the fact that we call it a treaty with Germany: and while it is a treaty with Germany, and in some senses a very severe treaty, indeed, it is not an unjust treaty, as some have characterized it. My fellow citizens, Germany tried to commit a crime against civilization, and this treaty is justified in making Germany pay for that criminal error up to the ability of her payment. Some of the very gentlement who are now characterizing this treaty as too harsh are the same men who less than a twelvemonth ago were criticizing the administration at Washington in

the fear that they would compound with Germany and let her off from the payment of the utmost that she could pay in retribution for what she had done. They were pitiless then; they are pitiful now.

It is very important, my fellow citizens, that we should not forget what this war meant. I am amazed at the indications that we are forgetting what we went through. There are some indications that on the other side of the water they are apt to forget what they went through. I venture to think that there are thousands of mothers and fathers and wives and sisters and sweethearts in this country who are never going to forget. Thousands of our gallant youth lie buried in France, and buried for what? For the redemption of America? America was not directly attacked. For the salvation of America? America was not immediately in danger. No; for the salvation of mankind. It is the noblest errand that troops ever went on.

The fundamental principle of this treaty is a principle never acknowledged before, a principle which had its birth and has had its growth in this country, that the countries of the world belong to the people who live in them, and that they have a right to determine their own destiny and their own form of government and their own policy, and that no body of statesmen, sitting anywhere, no matter whether they represent the overwhelming physical force of the world or not, has the right to assign any great people to a sovereignty under which it does not care to live. This is the great treaty which is being debated. This is the treaty which is being examined with a microscope. This is the treaty which is being pulled about and about which suggestions are made as to changes of phraseology. Why, my friends, are you going to be so nearsighted as to look that way at a great charter of human liberty? The thing is impossible. You can not have any other treaty, because you can never get together again the elements that agreed to this treaty. You can not do it by dealing with separate

governments. You can not assemble the forces again that were back of it. You can not bring the agreement upon which it rests into force again. It was the laborious work of many, many months of the most intimate conference. It has very, very few compromises in it and is, most of it, laid down in straight lines according to American specifications. The choice is either to accept this treaty or play a lone hand. What does that mean? To play a lone hand means that we must always be ready to play by ourselves. That means that we must always be armed, that we must always be ready to mobilize the man strength and the manufacturing resources of the country; it means that we must continue to live under not diminishing but increasing taxes; it means that we shall devote our thought and the organization of our Government to being strong enough to beat any nation in the world. An absolute reversal of all the ideals of American history. If you are going to play a lone hand, the hand that you play must be upon the handle of the sword. You can not play a lone hand and do your civil business except with the other hand—one hand incidental for the business of peace, the other hand constantly for the assertion of force. It is either this treaty or a lone hand, and the lone hand must have a weapon in it. The weapon must be all the young men of the country trained to arms, and the business of the country must pay the piper, must pay for the whole armament, the arms and the men. That is the choice. Do you suppose, my fellow citizens, that any nation is going to stand for that? We are not the only people who are sick of war. We are not the only people who have made up our minds that our Government must devote its attention to peace and to justice and to right. The people all over the world have made up their minds as to that. We need peace more than we ever needed it before. We need ordered peace, calm peace, settled peace, assured peace—for what have we to do? We have to reregulate the fortunes of men. We have

to reconstruct the machinery of civilization. I use the words deliberately—we have to reconstruct the machinery of civilization.

The central fact of the modern world is universal unrest, and the unrest is not due merely to the excitement of a recent war. The unrest is not due merely to the fact of recent extraordinary circumstances. It is due to a universal conviction that the conditions under which men live and labor are not satisfactory. It is a conviction all over the world that there is no use talking about political democracy unless you have also industrial democracy. You know what this war interrupted in the United States. We were searching our own hearts; we were looking closely at our own methods of doing business. A great many were convinced that the control of the business of this country was in too few hands. Some were convinced that the credit of the country was controlled by small groups of men, and the great Federal reserve act and the great land-bank act were passed in order to release the resources of the country on a broader and more generous scale. We had not finished dealing with monopolies. We have not finished dealing with monopolies. With monopolies there can be no industrial democracy. With the control of the few, of whatever kind or class, there can be no democracy of any sort. The world is finding that out in some portions of it in blood and terror.

Look what has happened in Russia, my fellow citizens. I find wherever I go in America that my fellow citizens feel as I do, an infinite pity for that great people, an infinite longing to be of some service to them. Everybody who has mixed with the Russian people tells me that they are among the most lovable people in the world, a very gentle people, a very friendly people, a very simple people, and in their local life a very democratic people, people who easily trust you, and who expect you to be trustworthy as they are. Yet this people is delivered into the hands of

an intolerable tyranny. It came out of one tyranny to get into a worse. A little group of some thirty or forty men are the masters of that people at present. Nobody elected them. They chose themselves. They maintain their power by the sword, and they maintain the sword by seizing all the food of the country and letting only those who will fight for them eat, the rest of them to go starved; and because they can command no loyalty we are told by the newspapers that they are about to brand the men under arms for them, so that they will be forever marked as their servants and slaves. That is what pitiful Russia has got in for, and there will be many a bloody year, I am afraid, before she finds herself again.

I speak of Russia. Have you seen no symptoms of the spread of that sort of chaotic spirit into other countries? If you had been across the sea with me you would know that the dread in the mind of every thoughtful man in Europe is that that distemper will spread to their countries, that before there will be settled order there will be tragical disorder. Have you heard nothing of the propaganda of that sort of belief in the United States? That poison is running through the veins of the world, and we have made the methods of communication throughout the world such that all the veins of the world are open and the poison can circulate. The wireless throws it out upon the air. The cable whispers it underneath the sea. Men talk about it in little groups, men talk about it openly in great groups not only in Europe but here also in the United States. There are apostles of Lenin in our own midst. I can not imagine what it means to be an apostle of Lenin. It means to be an apostle of the night, of chaos, of disorder; there can be no creed of disorganization. Our immediate duty, therefore, my fellow countrymen, is to see that no minority, no class, no special interest, no matter how respectable, how rich, how poor, shall get control of the affairs of the United States.

The singular thing about the sort of disorder that pre-

vails in Russia is that while every man is, so to say, invited to take what he can get, he can not keep it when he gets it, because, even if you had leave to steal, which is the leave very generously given in Russia at present, you have got to get somebody to help you to keep what you steal. Without organization you can not get any help, so the only thing you can do is to dig a hole and find a cave somewhere. Disordered society is dissolved society. There is no society when there is not settled and calculable order. When you do not know what is going to happen to you tomorrow, you do not much care what is going to happen to you today. These are the things that confront us. The world must be satisfied of justice. The conditions of civilized life must be purified and perfected, and if we do not have peace, that is impossible. We must clear the decks of this matter we are now discussing. This is the best treaty that can possibly be got, and, in my judgment, it is a mighty good treaty, for it has justice, the attempt at justice at any rate, at the heart of it.

Suppose that you were feeling that there was a danger of a general conflagration in your part of the country; I mean a literal fire. Which would you rather have, no insurance at all or 10 per cent insurance? Don't you think some insurance is better than none at all? Put the security obtained by this treaty at its minimum, and it is a great deal better than no security at all, and without it there is no security at all, and no man can be sure what his business will be from month to month, or what his life will be from year to year. The leisureliness of some debates creates the impression on my mind that some men think there is leisure. There is no leisure in the world, my fellow citizens, with regard to the reform of the conditions under which men live. There is no time for any talk, but get down to the business of what we are going to do.

I dare say that many of you know that I have called a conference to sit in Washington the first of next month,

a conference of men in the habit of managing business and of men engaged in manual labour, what we generally call employers and employees. I have called them together for the sake of getting their minds together, getting their purposes together, getting them to look at the picture of our life at the same time and in the same light and from the same angles, so that they can see the things that ought to be done. I am trying to apply there what is applied in the great covenant of the League of Nations, that if there is any trouble, the thing to do is not to fight, but to sit around the table and talk it over. The League of Nations substitutes discussion for fight, and without discussion there will be fight.

Conference is the healing influence of civilization, and the real difficulty between classes, when a country is unfortunate enough to have classes, is that they do not understand one another. I sometimes think that the real barriers in life are the barriers of taste, that some people like one way of doing things and that other people do not like that way of doing things; that one sort of people are not comfortable unless the people they are with are dressed the way they are. I think that goes so much deeper than people realize. It is the absence of the ability to get at the point of view and look through the eyes of the persons with whom you are not accustomed to deal. In order, therefore, to straighten out the affairs of America, in order to calm and correct the ways of the world, the first and immediate requisite is peace, and it is an immediate requisite. We can not wait. It is not wise to wait, because we ought to devote our best thoughts, the best impulses of our hearts, the clearest thinking of our brain, to correcting the things that are wrong everywhere.

I have been told, my fellow citizens, that this western part of the country is particularly prevaded with what is called radicalism. There is only one way to meet radicalism and that is to deprive it of food, and wherever there

is anything wrong there is abundant food for radicalism. The only way to keep men from agitating against grievances is to remove the grievances, and as long as things are wrong I do not intend to ask men to stop agitating. I intend to beg that they will agitate in an orderly fashion; I intend to beg that they will use the orderly methods of counsel, and, it may be, the slow processes of correction which can be accomplished in a self-governing people through political means. Otherwise we will have chaos; but as long as there is something to correct, I say Godspeed to the men who are trying to correct it. That is the only way to meet radicalism. Radicalism means cutting up by the roots. Well, remove the noxious growth and there will be no cutting up by the roots. Then there will be the wholesome fruitage of an honest life from one end of this country to the other.

In looking over some papers the other day I was reminded of a very interesting thing. The difficulty which is being found with the League of Nations is that apparently the gentlemen who are discussing it unfavorably are afraid that we will be bound to do something we do not want to do. The only way in which you can have impartial determinations to this world is by consenting to something you do not want to do. Every time you have a case in court one or the other of the parties has to consent to do something he does not want to do. There is not a case in court, and there are hundreds of thousands of them every year, in which one of the parties is not disappointed. Yet we regard that as the foundation of civilization, that we will not fight about these things, and that when we lose in court we will take our medicine. Very well; I say that the two houses of Congress suggested that there be an international court, and suggested that they were willing to take their medicine. They put it in a place where you would not expect it. They put it in the naval appropriation bill, and, not satisfied with putting it there once, they put it there

several times; I mean in successive years. This is the sum of it:

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to adjust and settle its international disputes through mediation or arbitration (that is, the League of Nations), to the end that war may be honorably avoided. It looks with apprehension and disfavor upon a general increase of armament throughout the world, but it realizes that no single nation can disarm and that without a common agreement upon the subject every considerable power must maintain a relative standing in military strength. In view of the premises, the President is authorized and requested to invite at an appropriate time, not later than the close of the war in Europe (this immediately preceded our entry into the war), all the great Governments of the world to send representatives to a conference which shall be charged with the duty of formulating a plan for a court of arbitration or other tribunal to which disputed questions between nations shall be referred for adjustment and peaceful settlement, and to consider the question of disarmament and submit their recommendations to their respective Governments for approval. The President is hereby authorized to appoint," etc. A provision for an appropriation to pay the expenses is also embodied.

Now that they have got it, they do not like it. They also provided in this legislation that if there could be such an assemblage, if there could be such an agreement, the President was authorized to cancel the naval building program authorized by the bill, or so much of it as he thought was wise in the circumstances. They looked forward to it with such a practical eye that they contemplated the possibility of its coming soon enough to stop the building program of that bill. It came much sooner than they expected, and apparently has taken them so much by surprise as to confuse their minds. I suppose that this would be a very dull world if everybody were consistent, but consistency,

my fellow citizens, in the sober, fundamental, underlying principles of civilization is a very serious thing indeed.

If we are, indeed, headed toward peace with the real purpose of our hearts engaged, then we must take the necessary steps to secure it, and we must make the necessary sacrifices to secure it. I repudiate the suggestion which underlies some of the suggestions I have heard that the other nations of the world are acting in bad faith, and that only the United States is acting in good faith. It is not true. I can testify that I was coöperating with honorable men on the other side of the water, and I challenge anybody to show where in recent years, while the opinion of mankind has been effective, there has been the repudiation of any international obligation by France or Italy or Great Britain or by Japan. Japan has kept her engagements, and Japan here engages to unite with the rest of the world in maintaining justice and a peace based upon justice. There can be cited no instances where these Governments have been dishonorable, and I need not add that there is, of course, no instance where the United States has not kept faith.

When gentlemen discuss the right to withdraw from the League of Nations and look suspiciously upon the clause which says that we can withdraw upon two years' notice, if at that time we have fulfilled our international obligations, I am inclined to ask, "What are you worried about? Are you afraid that we will not have fulfilled our international obligations?" I am too proud an American to believe anything of the kind. We never have failed to fulfill our international obligations, and we never will, and our international obligations will always look toward the fulfillment of the highest purposes of civilization. When we came into existence as a nation we promised ourselves and promised the world that we would serve liberty everywhere. We were only 3,000,000 strong then, and shall we, when more than a hundred million strong, fail to fulfill the

promise that we made when we were weak? We have served mankind and we shall continue to serve mankind, for I believe, my fellow men, that we are the flower of mankind so far as civilization is concerned.

Please do not let me leave the impression on your mind that I am arguing with you. I am not arguing this case; I am merely expounding it. I am just as sure what the verdict of this nation is going to be as if it had been already rendered. What I am pleading for, therefore—not with you, for I anticipate your verdict—but what I am pleading for with the Senate of the United States is to be done with debate and release and satisfy the hope of the world.

ADDRESS AT OPERA HOUSE, HELENA, MONT.

SEPTEMBER 11, 1919

Governor Stewart and My Fellow Countrymen:

I want to put the case very simply to you tonight, for with all its complexity, with all the many aspects which it wears there is a very simple question at the heart of it. That question is nothing more nor less than this: Shall the great sacrifice that we made in this war be in vain, or shall it not? I want to say to you very solemnly that, notwithstanding the splendid achievement of our soldiers on the other side of the sea, who I do not hesitate to say saved the world, notwithstanding the noble things that they did, their task is only half done and it remains for us to complete it. I want to explain that to you. I want to explain to you why, if we left the thing where it is and did not carry out the program of the treaty of peace in all its fullness, men like these would have to die again to do the work over again and convince provincial statesmen that the world is one and that only by organization of the world can you save the young men of the world.

As I take up this theme there is a picture very distinct in my mind. Last Memorial Day I stood in an American cemetery in France just outside Paris, on the slopes of Surenes. The hills slope steeply to a little plain, and when I went out there all the slope of the hill was covered with men in the American uniform, standing, but rising tier on tier as if in a great witness stand. Then below, all over this little level space, were the simple crosses that marked the resting place of American dead. Just by the stand where I spoke was a group of French women who had lost their own sons, but, just because they had lost their own sons and because their hearts went out in thought and sympathy to the mothers on this side of the sea, had made themselves, so to say, mothers of those graves, had every day gone to take care of them, had every day strewn them with flowers. They stood there, their cheeks wetted with tears, while I spoke, not of the French dead but of the American boys who had died in the common cause, and there seemed to me to be drawn together on that day and in that little sunny spot the hearts of the world. I took occasion to say on that day that those who stood in the way of completing the task that those men had died for would some day look back upon it as those have looked back upon the days when they tried to divide this Union and prevent it from being a single nation united in a single form of liberty. For the completion of the work of those men is this, that the thing that they fought to stop shall never be attempted again.

I call you to mind that we did not go into this war willingly. I was in a position to know; in the providence of God, the leadership of this nation was intrusted to me during those early years of the war when we were not in it. I was aware through many subtle channels of the movements of opinion in this country, and I know that the thing that this country chiefly desired, the thing that you men out here in the West chiefly desired and the thing that of

course every loving woman had at her heart, was that we should keep out of the war, and we tried to persuade ourselves that the European business was not our business. We tried to convince ourselves that no matter what happened on the other side of the sea, no obligation of duty rested upon us, and finally we found the currents of humanity too strong for us. We found that a great consciousness was welling up in us that this was not a local cause, that this was not a struggle which was to be confined to Europe, or confined to Asia, to which it had spread, but that it was something that involved the very fate of civilization; and there was one great nation in the world that could not afford to stay out of it. There are gentlemen opposing the ratification of this treaty who at that time taunted the administration of the United States that it had lost touch with its international conscience. They were eager to go in, and now that they have got in, and are caught in the whole network of human conscience, they want to break out and stay out. We were caught in this thing by the action of a nation utterly unlike ourselves. What I mean to say is that the German nation, the German people, had no choice whatever as to whether it was to go into that war or not, did not know that it was going into it until its men were summoned to the colors. I remember, not once, but often, sitting at the Cabinet table in Washington I asked my colleagues what their impression was of the opinion of the country before we went into the war, and I remember one day one of my colleagues said to me, "Mr. President, I think the people of the country would take your advice and do what you suggested." "Why," I said, "that is not what I am waiting for; that is not enough. If they can not go in with a whoop, there is no use of their going in at all. I do not want them to wait on me. I am waiting on them. I want to know what the conscience of this country is speaking. I want to know what the purpose is arising in the minds of

the people of this country with regard to this world situation." When I thought I heard that voice, it was then that I proposed to the Congress of the United States that we should include ourselves in the challenge that Germany was giving to mankind.

We fought Germany in order that there should be a world fit to live in. The world is not fit to live in, my fellow citizens, if any great government is in a position to do what the German Government did—secretly plot a war and begin it with the whole strength of its people, without so much as consulting its own people. A great war can not begin with public deliberation. A great war can begin only by private plot, because the peoples of this world are not asleep, as they used to be. The German people is a great educated people. All the thoughtful men in Germany, so far as I have been able to learn, who were following peaceful pursuits—the bankers and the merchants and the manufacturers—deemed it folly to go into that war. They said so then and they have said so since, but they were not consulted. The masters of Germany were the general military staff; it was these men who nearly brought a complete cataclysm upon civilization itself. It stands to reason that if we permit anything of that sort to happen again we are recreant to the men we sent across the seas to fight this war. We are deliberately guilty then of preparing a situation which will inevitably lead to what? What shall I call it? The final war? Alas, my fellow citizens, it might be the final arrest, though I pray only the temporary arrest, of civilization itself; and America has, if I may take the liberty of saying so, a greater interest in the prevention of that war than any other nation. America is less exhausted by the recent war than the other belligerents; she is not exhausted at all. America has paid for the war that has gone by less heavily, in proportion to her wealth, than the other nations. America still has free capital enough for its own industries and for the indus-

tries of the other countries that have to build their industries anew. The next war would have to be paid for in American blood and American money. The nation of all nations that is most interested to prevent the recurrence of what has already happened is the nation which would assuredly have to bear the brunt of that great catastrophe—either have to bear it or stop where we are. Who is going to check the growth of this nation? Who is going to check the accumulation of physical power by this nation —if you choose to put it in that form? Who is going to reduce the natural resources of this country? Who is going to change the circumstance that we largely feed the rest of the world? Who is going to change the circumstance that many of our resources are unique and indispensable? America is going to grow more and more powerful; and the more powerful she is the more inevitable it is that she should be trustee for the peace of the world.

A miracle has happened. I dare say that many of you have in mind the very short course of American history. You know, when this nation was born and we were just a little group—3,000,000 people on the Atlantic coast—how the nations on the other side of the water and the statesmen of that day watched us with a certain condescension, looked upon us as a sort of group of hopeful children, pleased for the time being with the conception of absolute freedom and political liberty, far in advance of the other peoples of the world because less experienced than they, less aware of the difficulties of the great task that they had accomplished. As the years have gone by they have watched the growth of this nation with astonishment and for a long time with dismay. They watched it with dismay until a very interesting and significant thing happened. When we fought Cuba's battle for her, then they said, "Ah, it is the beginning of what we predicted. She will seize Cuba and, after Cuba, what she pleases to the south of her. It is the beginning of the history we have gone

through ourselves." They ought to have known; they set us the example! When we actually fulfilled to the letter our promise that we would set helpless Cuba up as an independent government and guarantee her independence—when we carried out that great policy we astounded and converted the world. Then began—let me repeat the word again—then began the confidence of the world in America, and I want to testify to you to-night that nothing was more overpowering to me and my colleagues in Paris than the evidences of the absolutely unquestioning confidence of the peoples of the world in the people of America. We were touched by it not only, but I must admit we were frightened by it, because we knew that they were expecting things of us that we could not accomplish; we knew that they were hoping for some miracle of justice which would set them forward the same hundred years that we have traveled on the progress toward free government; and we knew that it was a slow road; we knew that you could not suddenly transform a people from a people of subjects into a people of self-governing units. And I perhaps returned a little bit to my own profession of teaching and tried to point out to them that some of the things they were expecting of us could not be done now; but they refused to be disabused of their absolute confidence that America could and would do anything that was right for the other peoples of the world. An amazing thing! What was more interesting still, my fellow citizens, was this: It happened that America laid down the specifications for the peace. It happened that America proposed the principles upon which the peace with Germany should be built. I use the word "happened" because I have found, and everybody who has looked into the hearts of some of the people on the other side of the water has found, that the people on the other side of the water, whatever may be said about their Governments, had learned their lesson from America before, and they believed in those principles

before we promulgated them; and their statesmen, knowing that their people believed in them, accepted them—accepted them before the American representatives crossed the sea. We found them ready to lay down the foundations of that peace along the lines that America had suggested, and all of Europe was aware that what was being done was building up an American peace. In such circumstances we were under a peculiar compulsion to carry the work to the point which had filled our convictions from the first.

Where did the suggestion first come from? Where did the idea first spread that there should be a society of nations? It was first suggested and it first spread in the United States, and some gentlemen were the chief proponents of it who are now objecting to the adoption of the covenant of the League of Nations. They went further, some of them, than any principle of that covenant goes, and now for some reason which I must admit is inscrutable to me they are opposing the very thing into which they put their heart and their genius. All Europe knew that we were doing an American thing when we put the covenant of the League of Nations at the beginning of the treaty, and one of the most interesting things over there was our dealing with some of the most cynical men I had to deal with, and there were some cynics over there—men who believed in what has come to be known as the old Darwinian idea of the survival of the fittest. They said: "In nature the strong eats up the weak, and in politics the strong overcomes and dominates the weak. It has always been so, and it is always going to be so." When I first got to Paris they talked about the League of Nations indulgently in my presence, politely. I think some of them had the idea, "Oh, well, we must humor Wilson along so that he will not make a public fuss about it," and those very men, before our conferences were over, suggested more often than anybody else that some of the most diffi-

cult and delicate tasks in carrying out this peace should be left to the League of Nations, and they all admitted that the League of Nations, which they had deemed an ideal dream, was a demonstrable, practical necessity. This treaty can not be carried out without the League of Nations, and I will tell you some interesting cases.

I have several times said, and perhaps I may say again, that one of the principal things about this treaty is that it establishes the land titles of the world. It says, for example, that Bohemia shall belong to the Bohemians and not to the Austrians or to the Hungarians; that if the Bohemians do not want to live under a monarchy, dual or single, it is their business and not ours, and they can do what they please with their own country. We have said of the Austrian territories south of Austria and Hungary, occupied by the Jugo-Slavs, "These never did belong to Austria; they always did belong to the Slavs, and the Slavs shall have them for their own, and we will guarantee the title." I have several times asked, "Suppose that the land titles of a State like Montana were clearly enough stated and somewhere recorded, but that there was no way of enforcing them." You know what would happen. Every one of you would enforce his own land title. You used to go armed here long ago, and you would resume the habit if there was nobody to guarantee your legal title. You would have to resume the habit. If society is not going to guarantee your titles, you have got to see to it yourselves that others respect them. That was the condition of Europe and will be the condition of Europe again if these settled land titles which have been laid out are not guaranteed by organized society, and the only organized society that can guarantee them is a society of nations.

It was not easy to draw the line. It was not a surveyor's task. There were not well-known points from which to start and to which to go, because, for example, we were trying to give the Bohemians the lands where the Bohe-

mians lived, but the Bohemians did not stop at a straight line. If they will pardon the expression, they slopped over. And Germans slopped over into Poland and in some places there was an almost inextricable mixture of the two populations. Everybody said that the statistics lied. They said the German statistics with regard to high Silesia, for example, were not true, because the Germans wanted to make it out that the Germans were in a majority there, and the Poles declared that the Poles were in the majority there. We said, "This is a difficult business. Sitting in Paris we can not tell by count how many Poles there are in high Silesia, or how many Germans, and if we could count them, we can not tell from Paris what they want. High Silesia does not belong to us, it does not belong to anybody but the people who live in it. We will do this: We will put that territory under the care of the League of Nations for a little period; we will establish a small armed force there, made up of contingents out of the different allied nations so that no one of them would be in control, and then we will hold a referendum, and high Silesia shall belong either to Germany or to Poland as the people in high Silesia desire." That is only one case out of half a dozen. In regions where the make-up of the population is doubtful or the desire of the population is as yet unascertained, the League of Nations is to be the instrumentality by which the goods are to be delivered to the people to whom they belong. No other international conference ever conceived such a purpose, and no earlier conference of that sort would have been willing to carry out such a purpose. Up to the time of this war, my fellow citizens, it was the firm and fixed conviction of statesmen in Europe that the greater nations ought to dominate and guide and determine the destiny of the weaker nations, and the American principle was rejected. The American principle is that, just as the weak man has the same legal rights that the strong man has, just as the poor man has the same rights as the

rich, though I am sorry to say he does not always get them, so as between nations the principle of equality is the only principle of justice, and the weak nations have just as many rights and just the same rights as the strong nations. If you do not establish that principle, then this war is going to come again, because this war came by aggression upon a weak nation.

What happened, my fellow citizens? Don't you remember? The Crown Prince of Austria was assassinated in Serbia. Not assassinated by anybody over whom the Government of Serbia had any control, but assassinated by some man who had at his heart the memory of something that was intolerable to him that had been done to the people that he belonged to, and the Austrian Government, not immediately but by suggestion from Berlin, where it was whispered, "We are ready for the World War, and this is a good chance to begin it; the other nations do not believe we are going to begin it; we will begin it and overwhelm France, first of all, before the others can come to her rescue." The Austrian Government sent an ultimatum to Serbia practically demanding of her that she surrender to them her sovereign rights, and gave her twenty-four hours to decide. Poor Serbia, in her sudden terror, with memory of things that had happened before and might happen again, practically yielded to every demand, and with regard to a little portion of the ultimatum said she would like to talk it over with them, and they did not dare wait. They knew that if the world ever had the facts of that dispute laid before them the opinion of mankind would overwhelm anybody that took aggression against Serbia in such circumstances. The point is that they chose this little nation. They had always chosen the Balkans as the ground of their intrigue. German princes were planted all through the Balkans, so that when Germany got ready she could use the Balkan situation as pawns in her game.

And what does the treaty of peace do? The treaty of

peace sets all those nations up in independence again; gives Serbia back what had been torn away from her, sets up the Jugo-Slavic states and the Bohemian states under the name of Czechoslovakia; and if you leave it at that, you leave those nations just as weak as they were before. By giving them their land titles, you do not make them any stronger. You make them stronger in spirit, it may be, they see a new day, they feel a new enthusiasm, their old love of their country can now express itself in action, but physically they are no stronger than they were before, and that road that we heard so much of—from Bremen to Bagdad—is wide open. The Germans were traveling that road. Their general staff interrupted the game. The merchants and manufacturers and bankers of Germany were making conquest of the world. All they had to do was to wait a little while longer, and long German fingers would have been stretched all through that country which never could have been withdrawn. The war spoiled the game. German intrigue was penetrating all those countries and controlling them. The dirty center of the intrigue, dirty in every respect, was Constantinople, and from there ramified all the threads that made this web, in the center of which was the venomous spider. If you leave that road open, if you leave those nations to take care of themselves, knowing that they can not take care of themselves, then you have committed the unpardonable sin of undoing the victory which our boys won. You say, "What have we got to do with it?" Let us answer that question, and not from a sentimental point of view at all. Suppose we did not have any hearts under our jackets. Suppose we did not care for these people. Care for them? Why, their kinsmen are everywhere in the communities of the United States, people who love people over there are everywhere in the United States. We are made up out of mankind; we can not tear our hearts away from them. Our hearts are theirs, but suppose they were not. Suppose we had

forgotten everything except the material, commerci
etary interests of the United States. You can not g
markets away from Germany if you let her re-
her old influence there. The 300,000,000 people
the Rhine and the Ural Mountains will be in suc
dition that they can not buy anything, their indus
not start, unless they surrender themselves to the bankers of Mittel-Europa, that you used to hear about; and the peoples of Italy and France and Belgium, some 80,000,000 strong, who are your natural customers, can not buy anything in disturbed and bankrupt Europe. If you are going to trade with them, you have got to go partners with them.

When I hear gentlemen talk about America standing for herself, I wonder where they have been living. Has America disconnected herself from the rest of the world? Her ambition has been to connect herself with all the rest of the world commercially, and she is bankrupt unless she does. Look at the actual situation right now, my fellow citizens. The war was a very great stimulation to some of the greatest of the manufacturing industries of this country, and a very interesting thing has been going on. You remember, some of you perhaps painfully remember, that the Congress of the United States put a very heavy tax on excess profits, and a great many men who were making large excess profits said, "All right, we can manage this. These will not be profits; we will spend these in enlarging our plants, advertising, increasing our facilities, spreading our agencies." They have got ready for a bigger business than they can do unless they have the world to do it in, and if they have not the world to do it in, there will be a recession of prosperity in this country; there will be unemployment; there will be bankruptcy in some cases. The giant is so big that he will burst his jacket. The rest of the world is necessary to us, if you want to put it on that basis. I do not like to put it on that basis. That

is not the American basis. America does not want to feed upon the rest of the world. She wants to feed it and serve it. America, if I may say it without offense to great peoples for whom I have a profound admiration on the other side of the water, is the only national idealistic force in the world, and idealism is going to save the world. Selfishness will embroil it. Narrow selfishness will tie things up into ugly knots that you can not get open except with a sword. All the human passions, if aroused on the wrong side, will do the world an eternal disservice.

I remember somebody said to me one day, using a familiar phrase, that this was an age in which mind was monarch, and my reply was, "Well, if that is true, mind is one of those modern monarchs that reign and do not govern; as a matter of fact, we are governed by a great popular assembly made up of the passions, and the best that we can manage is that the handsome passions shall be in the majority." That is the task of mankind, that the handsome passions, the handsome sentiments, the handsome purposes, shall always have a dominating and working majority, so that they will always be able to outvote the baser passions, to defeat all the cupidities and meannesses and criminalities of the world. That is the program of civilization. The basis of the program of civilization, I want to say with all the emphasis that I am capable of, is Christian and not pagan, and in the presence of this inevitable partnership with the rest of the world, these gentlemen say, "We will not sign the articles of copartnership." Well, why not? You have heard, I dare say, only about four things in the covenant of the League of Nations. I have not heard them talk about anything else. It is a very wonderful document and you would think there were only four things in it. The things that they talk about are the chance to get out, the dangers of Article X, the Monroe Doctrine, and the risk that other nations may interfere in our domestic affairs. Those are the things that keep them awake at

night, and I want very briefly to take those things in their sequence.

I do not like to discuss some of them. If I go to do a thing, I do not say at the beginning, "My chief interest in this thing is how I am going to get out." I will not be a very trusted or revered partner if it is evident that my fear is that I will continue to be a partner. But we will take that risk. We will sit by the door with our hand on the knob, and sit on the edge of our chair. There is nothing in the covenant to prevent our going out whenever we please, with the single limitation that we give two years' notice. The gentlemen who discuss this thing do not object to the two years' notice; they say, "It says that you can get out after two years' notice if at that time you have fulfilled your international obligations," and they are afraid somebody will have the right to say that they have not. That right can not belong to anybody unless you give it to somebody, and the covenant of the League does not give it to anybody. It is absolutely left to the conscience of this nation, as to the conscience of every other member of the League, to determine whether at the time of its withdrawal it has fulfilled its international obligations or not; and inasmuch as the United States always has fulfilled its international obligations, I wonder what these gentlemen are afraid of! There is only one thing to restrain us from getting out, and that is the opinion of our fellow men, and that will not restrain us in any conceivable circumstance if we have followed the honorable course which we always have followed. I would be ashamed as an American to be afraid that when we wanted to get out we should not have fulfilled our international obligations.

Then comes Article X, for I am taking the questions in the order in which they come in the covenant itself. Let me repeat to you Article X nearly verbatim; I am not trying to repeat it exactly as it is written in the covenant. Every member of the League agrees to respect and pre-

serve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of the other members of the League. There is the guarantee of the land titles. Without that clause, there is no guarantee of the land titles. Without that clause the heart of the recent war is not cut out. The heart of the recent war was an absolute disregard of the territorial integrity and political independence of the smaller nations. If you do not cut the heart of the war out, that heart is going to live and beat and grow stronger, and we will have the cataclysm again. Then the article adds that it shall be the duty of the council of the League to advise the members of the League what steps may be necessary from time to time to carry out this agreement; to advise, not to direct. The Congress of the United States is just as free under that article to refuse to declare war as it is now; and it is very much safer than it is now. The opinion of the world and of the United States bade it to declare war in April, 1917. It would have been shamed before all mankind if it had not declared war then. It was not given audible advice by anybody but its own people, but it knew that the whole world was waiting for it to fulfill a manifest moral obligation. This advice can not be given, my fellow citizens, without the vote of the United States. The advice can not be given without a unanimous vote of the council of the League. The member of the council representing the United States has to vote aye before the United States or any other country can be advised to go to war under that agreement, unless the United States is herself a party. What does that mean? Unless the United States is going to seize somebody else's territory or somebody else is going to seize the territory of the United States. I do not contemplate it as a likely contingency that we are going to steal somebody else's territory, I dismiss that as not a serious probability, and I do not see anybody within reach who is going to take any of ours. But suppose we should

turn highwayman, or that some other nation should turn highwayman, and stretch its hands out for what belongs to us. Then what difference does it make what advice the council gives? We are in the scrap anyhow. In those circumstances Congress is not going to wait to hear what the council of the League says to determine whether it is going to war or not. The war will be its war. So that any way you turn Article X it does not alter in the least degree the freedom and independence of the United States with regard to its action in respect of war. All of that is stated in such plain language that I can not for the life of me understand how anybody reads it any other way. I know perfectly well that the men who wrote it read it the way I am interpreting it. I know that it is intended to be written that way, and if I am any judge of the English language, they succeeded in writing it that way.

Then they are anxious about the Monroe Doctrine. The covenant says in so many words that nothing in that document shall be taken as invalidating the Monroe Doctrine. I do not see what more you could say. While the matter was under debate in what was called the commission on the League of Nations, the body that drew the covenant up, in which were representatives of fourteen nations, I tried to think of some other language that could state it more unqualifiedly and I could not think of any other. Can you? Nothing in that document should be taken as invalidating the Monroe Doctrine—I can not say it any plainer than that—and yet by a peculiar particularity of anxiety these gentlemen can not believe their eyes; and from one point of view it is not strange, my fellow citizens. The rest of the world always looked askance on the Monroe Doctrine. It is true, though some people have forgotten it, that President Monroe uttered that doctrine at the suggestion of the British Cabinet, and in its initiation, in its birth, it came from Mr. Canning, who was Prime Minister of England and who wanted the aid of the United States in checking

the ambition of some of the European countries to establish their power in South America. Notwithstanding that, Great Britain did not like the Monroe Doctrine as we grew so big. It was one thing to have our assistance and another thing for us not to need her assistance. And the rest of the world had studiously avoided on all sorts of interesting occasions anything that could be interpreted as an acknowledgment of the Monroe Doctrine. So I am not altogether surprised that these gentlemen can not believe their eyes. Here the nations of Europe say that they are entering into an arrangement no part of which shall be interpreted as invalidating the Monroe Doctrine. I do not have to say anything more about that. To my mind, that is eminently satisfactory, and as long as I am President I shall feel an added freedom in applying, when I think fit, the Monroe Doctrine. I am very much interested in it, and I foresee occasions when it might be appropriately applied.

In the next place they are afraid that other nations will interfere in our domestic questions. There, again, the covenant of the League distinctly says that if any dispute arises which is found to relate to an exclusively domestic question, the council shall take no action with regard to it and make no report concerning it, and the questions that these gentlemen most often mention, namely the questions of the tariff and of immigration and of naturalization, are acknowledged by every authoritative student of international law without exception to be as, of course, domestic questions. These gentlemen want us to make an obvious thing painfully obvious by making a list of the domestic questions, and I object to making the list for this reason, that if you make a list you may leave something out. I remind all students of law within the sound of my voice of the old principle of the law that the mention of one thing is the exclusion of other things; that if you meant everything, you ought to have said everything; that if you

said a few things, you did not have the rest in mind. I object to making a list of domestic questions, because a domestic question may come up which I did not think of. In every such case the United States would be just as secure in her independent handling of the question as she is now.

Then, outside the covenant is the question of Shantung. Some gentlemen want to make a reservation or something that they clothe with a handsome name with regard to the Shantung provision, which is that the rights which Germany illicitly got, for she got it by duress, from China shall pass to Japan. While the war is in progress, Great Britain and France expressly in a written treaty, though a secret treaty, entered into an engagement with Japan that she should have all that Germany had in the Province of Shantung. If we repudiate this treaty in that matter Great Britain and France can not repudiate the other treaty, and they can not repudiate this treaty inasmuch as it confirms the other. Therefore, in order to take away from Japan, for she is in physical possession of it now, what Germany had in China, we shall have to fight Japan and Great Britain and France; and at the same time do China no service, because one of the things that is known to everybody is that when the United States consented, because of this promise of Great Britain and France, to putting that provision in the treaty, Japan agreed that she would not take all of what was given to her in the treaty; that, on the contrary, she would, just as soon as possible, after the treaty was carried out return every sovereign right or right resembling a sovereign right that Germany had enjoyed in Shantung to the Government of China, and that she would retain at Shantung only those economic rights with regard to the administration of the railway and the exploitation of certain mines that other countries enjoy elsewhere in China. It is not an exceptional arrangement—a very unfortunate arrangement, I think, elsewhere as there, for

China, but not an exceptional arrangement. Under it Japan will enjoy privileges exactly similar and concessions exactly similar to what other nations enjoy elsewhere in China and nothing more. In addition to that, if the treaty is entered into by the United States China will for the first time in her history have a forum to which to bring every wrong that is intended against her or that has been committed against her.

When you are studying Article X, my fellow citizens, I beg of you that you will read Article XI. I do not hear that very often referred to. Article XI—I am not going to quote the words of it—makes it the right of any member of the League to call attention to anything, anywhere, that is likely to disturb the peace of the world or the good understanding between nations upon which the peace of the world depends. Every aspiring people, every oppressed people, every people whose hearts can no longer stand the strain of the tyranny that has been put upon them, can find a champion to speak for it in the forum of the world. Until that covenant is adopted, what is the international law? International law is that no matter how deeply the United States is interested in something in some other part of the world that she believes is going to set the world on fire or disturb the friendly relations between two great nations, she can not speak of it unless she can show that her own interests are directly involved. It is a hostile and unfriendy act to call attention to it, and Article XI says, in so many words, that it shall be the friendly right of every nation to call attention to any such matter anywhere; so that if anybody contemplates anything that is an encroachment upon the rights of China he can be summoned to the bar of the world. I do not know when any nation that could not take care of itself, as unfortunately China can not, ever had such a humane advantage accorded it before. It is not only we, my fellow citizens, who are caught in all the implications of the affairs of the world;

everybody is caught in it now, and it is right that anything that affects the world should be made everybody's business.

The heart of the covenant of the League of Nations is this: Every member of the League promises never to go to war without first having done one or other of two things, either having submitted the matter to arbitration, in which case it agrees absolutely to abide by the award, or having submitted it to discussion by the council of the League of Nations. If it submits it for discussion by the council, it agrees to allow six months for the discussion and to lay all the documents and facts in its possession before the council, which is authorized to publish them; and even if it is not satisfied with the opinion rendered by the council, it agrees that it will not go to war within less than three months after the publication of that judgment. There are nine months in which the whole matter is before the bar of mankind, and, my fellow citizens, I make this confident prediction, that no nation will dare submit a bad case to that jury. I believe that this covenant is better than 95 per cent insurance against war. Suppose it was only 5 per cent insurance; would not you want it? If you can get any insurance against war, do not you want it? I ask any mother, any father, any brother, anybody with a heart, "Do not you want some insurance against war, no matter how little?" And the experience of mankind, from the conferences between employers and employees, is that if people get together and talk things over, it becomes more and more difficult to fight the longer they talk. There is not any subject that has not two sides to it, and the reason most men will not enter into discussion with antagonists is that they are afraid the other fellows' side will be stronger than theirs. The only thing you are afraid of, my fellow citizens, is the truth.

A cynical old politician once said to his son, "John, do not bother your head about lies; they will take care of themselves, but if you ever hear me denying anything you

may make up your mind it is so." The only thing that is formidable is the truth. I learned what I know about Mexico, which is not as much as I should desire, by hearing a large number of liars tell me all about it. At first, I was very much confused, because the narratives did not tally, and then one day, when I had a lucid interval, it occurred to me that that was because what was told me was not true. The truth always matches; it is lies that do not match. I also observed that back of all these confusing contradictions there was a general mass of facts which they all stated, and I knew that that was the region into which their lying capacity did not extend. They had not had time to make up any lies about that, and the correspondences in their narratives constituted the truth. The differences could be forgotten. So I learned a great deal about Mexico by listening to a sufficiently large number of liars. The truth is the regnant and triumphant thing in this world. You may trample it under foot, you may blind its eyes with blood, but you can not kill it, and sooner or later it rises up and seeks and gets its revenge.

That is what it behooves us to remember, my fellow citizens, in these radical days. The men who want to cure the wrongs of governments by destroying government are going to be destroyed themselves; destroyed, I mean, by the chaos that they have created, because remove the organism of society and, even if you are strong enough to take anything that you want, you are not smart enough to keep it. The next stronger fellow will take it away from you and the most audacious group amongst you will make slaves and tools of you. That is the truth that is going to master society in Russia and in any other place that tries Russia's unhappy example. I hope you will not think it inappropriate if I stop here to express my shame as an American citizen at the race riots that have occurred in some places in this country where men have forgotten humanity and justice and ordered society and have run

amuck. That constitutes a man not only the enemy of society but his own enemy and the enemy of justice. I want to say this, too, that a strike of the policemen of a great city, leaving that city at the mercy of an army of thugs, is a crime against civilization. In my judgment, the obligation of a policeman is as sacred and direct as the obligation of a soldier. He is a public servant, not a private employee, and the whole honor and safety of the community is in his hands. He has no right to prefer any private advantage to the public safety. I hope that that lesson will be burned in so that it will never again be forgotten, because the pride of America is that it can exercise self-control. That is what a self-governing nation is, not merely a nation that elects people to do its jobs for it, but a nation that can keep its head, concert its purposes, and find out how its purposes can be executed.

One of the noblest sentences ever uttered was uttered by Mr. Garfield before he became President. He was a member of Congress, as I remember it, at the time of Mr. Lincoln's assassination. He happened to be in New York City, and Madison Square was filled with a surging mass of deeply excited people when the news of the murder came. Mr. Garfield was at the old Fifth Avenue Hotel, which had a balcony out over the entrance, and they begged him to go out and say something to the people. He went out and, after he had attracted their attention, he said this beautiful thing: "My fellow citizens, the President is dead, but the Government lives and God omnipotent reigns." America is the place where you can not kill your Government by killing the men who conduct it. The only way you can kill government in America is by making the men and women of America forget how to govern, and nobody can do that. They sometimes find the team a little difficult to drive, but they sooner or later whip it into harness. And, my fellow citizens, the underlying thought of what I have tried to say to you tonight is the organiza-

tion of the world for order and peace. Our fortunes are directly involved, and my mind reverts to that scene that I painted for you at the outset—that slope at Suresnes, those voiceless graves, those weeping women—and I say, "My fellow citizens, the pledge that speaks from those graves is demanded of us. We must see to it that those boys did not die in vain. We must fulfill the great mission upon which they crossed the sea."

Address at Coeur D'Alene, Idaho

September 12, 1919

Your Excellency, My Fellow Citizens:

It was with the most earnest desire to get in touch with you and the rest of my fellow countrymen that I undertook this trip, for we are facing a decision now in which we can not afford to make a mistake. We must not let ourselves be deceived as to the gravity of that decision or as to the implications of that decision. It will mean a great deal now, but it will mean infinitely more in the future. America has to do at this moment nothing less than prove to the world whether she has meant what she said in the past.

I must confess that I have been amazed that there are some men in responsible positions who are opposed to the ratification of the treaty of peace altogether. It is natural that so great a document, full of so many particular provisions, should draw criticism upon itself for this, that, or the other provision. It is natural that a world settlement, for it is nothing less, should give occasion for a great many differences of opinion with regard to particular settlements of it, but I must admit that it amazes me that there should be any who should propose that the arrangement be rejected altogether, because, my fellow citizens,

this is the issue: We went into this Great War from which we have just issued with certain assurances given ourselves and given the world, and these assurances can not be fulfilled unless this treaty is adopted. We told the world and we assured ourselves that we went into this war in order to see to it that the kind of purpose represented by Germany in this war should never be permitted to be accomplished by Germany or anybody else. Do not let your thoughts dwell too constantly upon Germany. Germany attempted this outrageous thing, but Germany was not the only country that had ever entertained the purpose of subjecting the peoples of the world to its will, and when we went into this war we said that we sent our soldiers across the seas not because we thought this was an American fight in particular, but because we knew that the purpose of Germany was against liberty, and that where anybody was fighting liberty it was our duty to go into the contest. We set this nation up with the profession that we wanted to set an example of liberty not only, but to lead the world in the paths of liberty and justice and of right; and at last, after long reflection, after long hesitation, after trying to persuade ourselves that this was a European war and nothing more, we suddenly looked our own consciences in the face and said, "This is not merely a European war. This is a war which imperils the very principles for which this Government was set up, and it is our duty to lend all the force that we have, whether of men or of resources, to the resistance of these designs." And it was America—never let anybody forget this—it was America that saved the world, and those who propose the rejection of the treaty propose that, after having redeemed the world, we should desert the world. It would be nothing less.

The settlements of this treaty can not be maintained without the concerted action of all the great Governments of the world. I asked you just now not to think exclusively about Germany, but turn your thoughts back to what

it was that Germany proposed. Germany did direct her first force against France and against Belgium, but you know that it was not her purpose to remain in France, though it was part of her purpose to remain in Belgium. She was using her arms against these people so that they could not prevent what she intended elsewhere, and what she intended elsewhere was to make an open line of dominion between her and the Far East. The formula that she adopted was Bremen to Bagdad, the North Sea to Persia —to crush not only little Serbia, whom she first started to crush, but all the Balkan States, get Turkey in her grasp, take all the Turkish and Arabian lands beyond, penetrate the wealthy realms of Persia, open the gates of India, and, by dominating the central trade routes of the world, dominate the world itself. That was her plan; and what does the treaty of peace do? For I want you to remember, my fellow countrymen, that this treaty is not going to stand by itself. The treaty with Austria has now been signed; it will presently be sent over, and I shall lay that before the Senate of the United States. It will be laid down along exactly the same lines as the treaty with Germany; and the lines of the treaty with Germany suggest this, that we are setting up the very states which Germany and Austria intended to dominate as independent, self-governing units. We are giving them what they never could have got with their own strength, what they could have got only by the united strength of the armies of the world. But we have not made them strong by making them independent. We have given them what I have called their land titles. We have said, "These lands that others have tried to dominate and exploit for their own uses belong to you, and we assign them to you in fee simple. They never did belong to anybody else. They were loot. It was brigandage to take them. We give them to you in fee simple." But what is the use of setting up the titles if we do not guarantee them? And that guaranty is the only guaranty

against the repetition of the war we have gone through just so soon as the German nation, 60,000,000 strong, can again recover its strength and its spirit, for east of Germany lies the fertile field of intrigue and power. At this moment the only people who are dealing with the Bolshevist government in Russia are the Germans. They are fraternizing with the few who exercise control in that distracted country. They are making all their plans that the financing of Russia and the commerce of Russia and the development of Russia shall be as soon as possible in the hands of Germans; and just so soon as she can swing that great power, that is also her road to the East and to the domination of the world. If you do not guarantee the titles that you are getting up in these treaties, you leave the whole ground fallow in which again to sow the dragon's teeth with the harvest of armed men.

That, my fellow citizens, is what Article X, that you hear so much talked about in the covenant of the League of Nations, does. It guarantees the land titles of the world; and if you do not guarantee the land titles of the world, there can not be the ordered society in which men can live. Off here in this beloved continent, with its great free stretches and its great free people, we have not realized the cloud of dread and terror under which the people of Europe have lived. I have heard men over there say, "It is intolerable. We would rather die now than live another fifty years under the cloud that has hung over us ever since the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71, because we have known that this force was gathering, we have known what the purpose was ultimately to be, we have known that blood and terror lay ahead of us, and we can not and will not live under that cloud any more." America, my fellow citizens, is necessary to the peace of the world. America is absolutely necessary to the peace of the world. Germany realizes that; and I want to tell you now and here—I wish I could proclaim it in tones so loud

that they would reach the world—Germany wants us to stay out of this treaty. Not under any deception. Not under the deception that we will turn in sympathy toward her. Not under the delusion that we would seek in any direct or conscious way to serve Germany, but with the knowledge that the guaranties will not be sufficient without America, and that, inasmuch as Germany is out of the arrangement, it will be very useful to Germany to have America out of the arrangement. Germany knows that if America is out of the arrangement America will lose the confidence and cooperation of all the other nations in the world, and, fearing America's strength, she wants to see America alienated from the peoples from whom she has been alienated. It is a perfectly reasonable program. She wants to see America isolated. She is isolated. She wants to see one great nation left out of this combination which she never would again dare face. Evidences are not lacking—nay, evidences are abounding—that the pro-German propaganda has started up in this country coincidently with the opposition to the adoption of this treaty. I want those who have any kind of sympathy with the purposes with which we went into the war now to reflect upon this proposition: Are we going to prove the enemy of the rest of the world just when we have proved their savior? The thing is intolerable. The thing is impossible. America has never been unfaithful and she never will be unfaithful.

Do not let anybody delude you, my fellow citizens, with the pose of being an American. If I am an American I want at least to be an intelligent American. If I am a true American I will study the true interests of America. If I am a true American I will have the world vision that America has always had, drawing her blood, drawing her genius, as she has drawn her people, out of all the great constructive peoples of the world. A true American conceives America in the atmosphere and whole setting of her

fortune and her destiny. And America needs the confidence of the rest of the world just as much as other nations do. America needs the cooperation of the rest of the world to release her resources, to make her markets, above all things else to link together the spirits of men who mean to redeem the race from the wrongs that it has suffered. This western country is par excellence the country of progressiveism. I am not now using it with a big "P." It does not make any difference whether you belong to the Progressive Party or not; you belong to the progressive thought, and I hope every intelligent man belongs to the progressive thought. It is the only thought that the world is going to tolerate. If you believe in progress, if you believe in progressive reform, if you believe in making the lot of men better, if you believe in purifying politics and enlarging the purposes of public policy, then you have got to have a world in which that will be possible; and if America does not enter with all her soul into this new world arrangement, progressives might as well go out of business, because there is going to be universal disorder, as there is now universal unrest.

Do not mistake the signs of the times, my fellow countrymen, and do not think that America is immune. The poison that has spread all through that pitiful nation of Russia is spreading all through Europe. There is not a statesman in Europe who does not dread the infection of it, and just so certainly as those people are disconcerted, thrown back upon their own resources, disheartened, rendered cynical by the withdrawal of the only people in the world they trust, just so certainly there will be universal upsetting of order in Europe. And if the order of Europe is upset, do you think America is going to be quiet? Have you not been reading in the papers of the intolerable thing that has just happened in Boston? When the police of a great city walk out and leave that city to be looted they have committed an intolerable crime against civilization;

and if that spirit is going to prevail, where are your programs? How can you carry a program out when every man is taking what he can get? How can you carry a program out when there is no authority upon which to base it? How can you carry a program out when every man is looking out for his own selfish interests and refuses to be bound by any law that regards the interests of the others? There will be no reform in this world for a generation if the conditions of the world are not now brought to settled order, and they can not be brought to settled order without the cooperation of America.

I am not speaking with conjecture, my fellow citizens. I would be ashamed of myself if upon a theme so great as this I should seek to mislead you by overstatement of any kind. I know what I am talking about. I have spent six months amidst those disturbed peoples on the other side of the water, and I can tell you, now and here, that the only people they depend upon to bring the world to settled conditions are the people of America. A chill will go to their heart, a discouragement will come down upon them, a cynicism will take possession of them, which will make progress impossible, if we do not take part not only, but do not take part with all our might and with all our genius. Everybody who loves justice and who hopes for programs of reform must support the unqualified adoption of this treaty. I send this challenge out to the conscience of every man in America, that if he knows anything of the conditions of the world, if he knows anything of the present state of society throughout the world and really loves justice and purposes just reform, he must support the treaty with Germany. I do not want to say that and have it proved by tragedy, for if this treaty should be refused, if it should be impaired, then amidst the tragedy of the things that would follow every man would be converted to the opinion that I am now uttering, but I do not want to see that sort of conversion. I do not want to see an era

of blood and of chaos to convert men to the only practical methods of justice.

My fellow citizens, there are a great many things needing to be reformed in America. We are not exempt from those very subtle influences which lead to all sorts of incidental injustice. We ourselves are in danger at this present moment of minorities trying to control our affairs, and whenever a minority tries to control the affairs of the country it is fighting against the interest of the country just as much as if it were trying to upset the Government. If you think that you can afford to live in a chaotic world, then speak words of encouragement to the men who are opposing this treaty, but if you want to have your own fortunes held steady, realize that the fortunes of the world must be held steady; that if you want to keep your own boys at home after this terrible experience, you will see that boys elsewhere are kept at home. Because America is not going to refuse, when the other catastrophe comes, again to attempt to save the world, and, having given this proof once, I pray God that we may not be given occasion to prove it again! We went into this war promising every loving heart in this country who had parted with a beloved youngster that we were going to fight a war which would make that sacrifice unnecessary again, and we must redeem that promise or be of all men the most unfaithful. If I did not go on this errand through the United States, if I did not do everything that was within my power that is honorable to get this treaty adopted, and adopted without qualification, I never could look another mother in the face upon whose cheeks there were the tears of sorrowful memory with regard to the boy buried across the sea. The moral compulsion laid upon America now is a compelling compulsion, and can not be escaped. My fellow countrymen, because it is a moral issue, because it is an issue in which is mixed up every sort of interest in America, I am not in the least uneasy about the result.

If you put it on the lowest levels, you can not trade with a world disordered, and if you do not trade you draw your own industries within a narrower and narrower limit. This great State, with its untold natural resources, with its great undeveloped resources, will have to stand for a long generation stagnant because there are no distant markets calling for these things. All America will have to wait a long, anxious generation through to see the normal courses of her life restored. So, if I were putting it upon the lowest conceivable basis of the amount of money we could make, I would say, "We have got to assist in the restoration of order and the maintenance of order throughout the world by the maintenance of the morale of the world." You will say, "How? By arms?" That, I suspect, is what most of the opponents of the League of Nations, at any rate, try to lead you to believe, that this is a league of arms. Why, my fellow citizens, it is a league to bring about the thing that America has been advocating ever since I was born. It is a league to bring it about that there shall not be war, but that there shall be substituted for it arbitration and the calm settlement of discussion. That is the heart of the League. The heart of the League is this: Every member of the League, and that will mean every fighting nation in the world except Germany, agrees that it will never go to war without first having done one or the other of two things—either having submitted the matter in dispute to arbitration, in which case it agrees absolutely to abide by the result, or having submitted it to consideration by the council of the League of Nations, in which case it promises to lay all the documents, all the facts, in its possession before the council and to give the council six months in which to consider the matter, and, if it does not like the opinion of the council at the end of the six months, still to wait three months more before it resorts to arms. That is what America has been striving for. That is what the Congress of the United States directed me to bring

about. Perhaps you do not know where; it was in an unexpected place, in the naval appropriations bill. Congress, authorizing a great building program of ships and the expenditure of vast sums of money to make our Navy one of the strongest in the world, paused a moment and declared in the midst of the appropriation bill that it was the policy of the United States to bring about disarmament and that for that purpose it was the policy of the United States to cooperate in the creation of a great international tribunal to which should be submitted questions of international difference and controversy, and it directed the President of the United States, not later than the close of this war, to call together an international conference for that purpose. It even went so far as to make an appropriation to pay the expenses for the conduct of such a conference in the city of Washington. And that is a continuing provision of the naval appropriations bill. When I came back with this covenant of the League of Nations, I had fulfilled the mandate of the Congress of the United States; and now they do not like it.

There is only one conceivable reason for not liking it, my fellow citizens, and to me as an American it is not a conceivable reason; that is that we should wish to do some nation some great wrong. If there is any nation in the world that can afford to submit its purposes to discussion, it is the American nation. If I belonged to some other nations, there are some things that I know that I would not like to see submitted to the discussion of mankind, but I do not know anything in the present purposes of the United States that I would not be perfectly willing to lay upon any table of counsel in the world. In carrying out the mandate of the Congress, I was serving the age-long purpose of this great people, which purpose centers in justice and in peace.

You will say, "Well, why not go in with reservations?" I wonder if you know what that means. If the Senate of

the United States passes a resolution of ratification and says that it ratifies on condition that so and so is understood, that will have to be resubmitted to every signatory of the treaty; and what gravels me is that it will have to be submitted to the German Assembly at Weimar. That goes against my digestion. We can not honorably put anything in that treaty, which Germany has signed and ratified, with Germany's consent; whereas it is perfectly feasible, my fellow countrymen, if we put interpretations upon that treaty which its language clearly warrants, to notify the other Governments of the world that we do understand the treaty in that sense. It is perfectly feasible to do that, and perfectly honorable to do that, because, mark you, nothing can be done under this treaty through the instrumentality of the council of the League of Nations except by a unanimous vote. The vote of the United States will always be necessary, and it is perfectly legitimate for the United States to notify the other Governments beforehand that its vote in the council of the League of Nations will be based upon such and such an understanding of the provisions of the treaty.

The treaty is not susceptible of misunderstanding. I do not object to painting the rose or refining fine gold; there is not any phrase in the covenant of the League of Nations that can legitimately be said to be of doubtful meaning, but if the Congress of the United States wants to state the meaning over again in other words and say to the other nations of the world, "We understand the treaty to mean what it says," I think that is a work of supererogation, but I do not see any moral objection to it. But anything that qualifies the treaty, anything that is a condition to our ratification of it, must be submitted to all the others, and we must go over this process again; this process which took six months of intensive labor, which took six months of very difficult adjustment and arrangement, which quieted jealousies, which allayed suspicions, which

set aside controversies, which brought about the most extraordinary union of minds that was ever brought about in so miscellaneous an assembly, divided by so many interests. All that must be gone over again, and in the meantime the world must wait and its unrest grow deeper, and all the pulses of life go slower, waiting to see what is going to happen, all because the United States asks the other governments of the world to accept what they have already accepted in different language. That is all that it amounts to; I mean, all that the reasonable reservations amount to. Some of them amount to staying out altogether, some of them amount to a radical change of the spirit of the instrument, but I am speaking now of those which some men of high conscience and of high public purpose are seriously pressing in order that there may be no misunderstanding. You can avoid a misunderstanding without changing the document. You can avoid a misunderstanding without qualifying the terms of the document, because, as I have said and shall say again and again, America is at liberty as one of the voting members of the partnership to state how she understands the articles of copartnership.

Address at Spokane, Wash.

September 12, 1919

Mr. Mayor, My Fellow Countrymen:

I do not think I need to tell you, my fellow citizens, that America and the world have come to the point where they must make one of the most critical choices ever made by great bodies of men or by nations. They have now to determine whether they will accept the one chance that has ever been offered to insure the peace of the world. I call it frankly a chance to insure the peace of the world. Nobody can guarantee the world against the ugly passions

that sometimes get abroad. Nobody can engage that the world will not again go mad with blood; but I want to put it frankly to you: Though the chance should be poor, is it not worth taking a chance? Let men discount the proposed arrangements as much as they will; let us regard it as an insurance policy. If you could get 10 per cent insurance of your fortunes in respect of peace, wouldn't you rather take it than no insurance at all? As a matter of fact, I believe, after having sat in conference with men all over the world and found the attitude of their minds, the character of their purposes, that this is a 99 per cent insurance against war. If the nations of the world will indeed and in truth accept this great covenant of a League of Nations and agree to put arbitration and discussion always first and war always last, I say that we have an immense insurance against war, and that is exactly what this great covenant does.

I have found it necessary upon this trip, my fellow citizens—I have actually found it necessary—to tell great audiences what the treaty of peace contains. You never could divine it from the discussion of the men who are opposed to it. Let me tell you some of the things that this treaty does, apart from the covenant of the League of Nations which stands by common consent of those who framed it at the beginning of it. Quite apart from the League of Nations, it is the first attempt ever made by an international congress to substitute justice for national advantage. It is the first attempt ever made to settle the affairs of the world according to the wishes of the people in the parts of the world that were being dealt with. It is a treaty that deals with peoples and nations, and not with dynasties and governments. Every representative of every great government I met on the other side of the sea acknowledged, as I, of course, acknowledge, that he was master of nobody, that he was the servant of the people whom he represented, and that the people he represented wanted

what the people of the United States wanted; they wanted a just and reasonable and permanent settlement, and that is what this treaty tried to give them. It substitutes for the aggression, which always was the beginning of war, a settled title on the part of the weak nations, along with the strong, to their own territories, a settled right to determine their own policies, a settled right to realize the national hopes so long suppressed, to free themselves from the oppression so long endured. Europe was full of people under the iron and relentless hand of military power, and that hand has been removed and crushed. This treaty is the means of doing it.

The guaranty of this treaty is the part of the covenant of nations which you have heard most criticized. I mean the now celebrated Article X. Article X is an engagement of the most extraordinary kind in history. It is an engagement by all the fighting nations of the world never to fight upon the plan upon which they always fought before. They, all of them, agree to respect and preserve against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of the others, and they agree that if there should be any breach of that covenant, the council of the League shall advise what steps shall be taken to make the promises good. That is the covenant with which you have been frightened. Frightened, my fellow citizens? Why, it is the only possible or conceivable guaranty against the wars that have ravaged the world, because those wars have habitually begun by territorial aggression, by the seizure of territory that did not belong to the power that was effecting the seizure. How did this great war begin? It began by the invasion of Belgium, and it was admitted by all German statesmen that they never meant to get out of Belgium. By guaranteeing the territorial integrity of a country, you do not mean that you guarantee it against invasion. You guarantee it against the invader staying there and keeping the spoils. The integrity is the

title, is the ownership. You agree never to take territory away from the people to whom it belongs, and you agree never to interfere with the political independence of the people living in these territories whose titles are now made clear by a universal international guaranty.

I want to discuss with you very frankly, indeed, just as frankly as I know how, the difficulties that have been suggested, because I say, not in the spirit of criticism, but in a spirit of entire intended fairness, that not one of the qualifications which have been suggested in this discussion is justified by the language of the instrument. Let me take them one by one. In the first article of the covenant of the League it is provided that any member state may withdraw from the League upon two years' notice, provided at the time of withdrawal it has fulfilled its international obligations and its obligations under the covenant. Gentlemen object that it is not said who shall determine whether it has fulfilled its international obligations and its obligations under the covenant or not. Having sat at the table where the instrument was drawn, I know that that was not by accident, because that is a matter upon which no nation can sit in judgment upon another. That is left to the conscience and the independent determination of the nation that is withdrawing, and there is only one jury that it need fear and that is the great embodied jury expressing the opinion of mankind. I want to differentiate myself, therefore, from the men who are afraid of that clause, because I want to record my feeling in the matter that, as an American, I am never afraid that the United States will fail to perform its international obligations; and, being certain that it will never fail in that respect, I have no fear that an occasion will arise when we need be sensitive to the opinion of mankind. That is the only jury set up in the case, and I am ready to go before that jury at any time. These gentlemen want to say what the instrument says, that we can withdraw when we please. The instrument

does not say it in those words, but it says it in effect, and the only limitation upon that is that we should not please unless we have done our duty. We never will please, God helping us, to neglect our duty.

The second difficulty—taking them in the order in which they have come in the covenant itself—is the article I was a moment ago discussing, Article X. Article X, as I told you, says, that if the promise to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of the member states is broken, then the council shall advise what is to be done. I do not know any but one meaning for the word "advise." I have been very curious and interested to learn how many other meanings have been put into it. I, in my surprise, have looked in the dictionary to be sure I was not mistaken, and so far as I can find out "advise" means "advise." And more interesting than that, the advice can not be given without the affirmative vote of the United States. There must be a unanimous vote of the council before there is advice, and the United States is a member of the council by the constitution of the League itself, a member now and always a member, so their neither the United States nor any other country can be advised to go to war for the redemption of that promise without the concurrent affirmative vote of the United States. Yet I hear gentlemen say that this is an invasion of our sovereignty. My fellow citizens, if it is anything, it is an exaggeration of our sovereignty, because it puts our sovereignty in a way to put a veto on that advice being given to anybody. Our present sovereignty merely extends to making choice whether we will go to war or not, but this extends our sovereignty to saying whether other nations shall go to war or not. If that does not constitute a very considerable insurance against war, I would like somebody to write a provision which would; because, at every point, my fellow citizens, the position of these gentlemen who criticize this instrument is either that

they do not understand the covenant or that they can suggest something better, and I have not heard one of them suggest anything better. In fact, I have never heard of them suggest anything. If the world is going to be at peace, it must be this or something better, and I want to say again it is a case of "put up or shut up."

Let me make a slight digression here, if I may, to speak about a matter of some delicacy. I have had a great many men say to me, "I am a Republican, but I am in favor of the League of Nations." Why the "but." I want to tell you, my fellow citizens, that there is one element in this whole discussion which ought not to be in it. There is, though I say it myself, an element of personal bitterness. One would suppose that this covenant of the League of Nations was first thought of and first invented and first written by a man named Wilson. I wish it were. If I had done that, I would be willing to have it recorded that I had done that and nothing else. But I did not do it. I, along with thousands of my fellow countrymen, got the idea twenty years ago, chiefly from Republican public men. Take men like ex-Senator Burton, of Ohio. He has been preaching a League of Nations for twenty years. I do not want to mention names, because I do not want to record gentlemen against themselves, but go through the list and you will find most of the leading, thinking minds on the Republican side in favor of this very kind of thing, and I want to remind every Republican of the criticism that he and his comrades have usually made of the Democratic Party, and the boast that they have generally made of their party. They said that the Democratic Party was a party of negations and not a party of constructive policies, and that the Republican Party was a party of constructive policy. Very well, then, why that "but." "I am a Republican, but I am in favor of the greatest constructive thing that has ever been suggested!" If I were a Republican, I would say, "I am a Republican and therefore I am

in favor of a League of Nations." My present point is to dissociate the League of Nations from the present speaker. I did not originate it. It is not my handiwork. It has originated out of the consciences and thought of men who wanted justice and loved peace for generations, and my relationship to it is just what my relationship ought to be to every public question, the relationship which a man bears to his fellow citizens when he tries to interpret their thought and their conscience. That is what I conceive to be my part in the League of Nations. I did have a part in some of the phraseology, and every time I did it was to carry out the ideas that these gentlemen are fighting for.

For example, there is one part of the covenant, the principal part of it, where it speaks of arbitration and discussion, where it provides that any member state, failing to keep these particular covenants, shall be regarded as thereby ipso facto to have committed an act of war against the other members. The way it originally read was, "Shall thereby ipso facto be deemed at war with the other members," and I said, "No; I can not agree to that. That provision would put the United States at war without the consent of the Congress of the United States, and I have no right in this part of the covenant or any other to assent to a provision which would deprive the Congress of the United States of its free choice whether it makes war or not." There, and at every other point in the covenant where it was necessary to do so, I insisted upon language which would leave the Congress of the United States free, and yet these gentlemen say that the Congress of the United States is deprived of its liberty. I fought that battle and won it. It is not necessary for them to fight it over again.

You will say, "It is all very well what you say about the vote of the United States being necessary to the advice provided the United States is not one of the parties to the dispute. In that case it can not vote." That is very true;

but in that case it has got the fight on its hands anyhow, because if it is one of the parties to the dispute the war belongs to it. It does not have to go into it, and therefore it can not be forced by the vote of the United States in the council to go into the war. The only thing the vote can do is to force it out of the war. I want to ask you to think what it means when it is suggested that the United States may be a party. A party to what? A party to seizing somebody else's territory? A party to infringing some other country's political independence? Is any man willing to stand on this platform and say that the United States is likely to do either of those things? I challenge any man to stand up before an American audience and say that that is the danger. "Ah, but somebody else may seek to seize our territory or impair our political independence." Well, who? Who has an arm long enough, who has an audacity great enough to try to take a single inch of American territory or to seek to interfere for one moment with the political independence of the United States? These gentlemen are dreaming of things that can not happen, and I can not bring myself to feel uneasy in the presence of things that I know are not so. The great difficulty in this discussion, as in so many others, is in the number of things that men know that are not so.

"But the Monroe Doctrine." I must admit to you, my fellow citizens, I do not know how the Monroe Doctrine could be any more explicitly accepted than it is in the covenant of the League of Nations. It says that nothing in the covenant shall be interpreted as impairing the validity of the Monroe Doctrine. What more could you say? I did try while I was in Paris to define the Monroe Doctrine and get it written into the document, but I will confide to you in confidence that when I tried to define it I found that it escaped analysis, that all that you could say was that it was a principle with regard to the interference of foreign powers in the politics of the Western Hemisphere

which the United States felt at liberty to apply in any circumstances where it thought it pertinent. That is not a definition. That means that the United States means to play big brother to the Western Hemisphere in any circumstances where it thinks it wise to play big brother. Therefore, inasmuch as you could not or would not define the Monroe Doctrine—at least I would not, because I do not know how much we may want to extend it—what more could you say than that nothing in that instrument shall impair the validity of the Monroe Doctrine? I tell you, my fellow citizens, that is the most extraordinary sentence in that treaty, for this reason: Up to that time there was not a nation in the world that was willing to admit the validity of the Monroe Doctrine. I have made a great many speeches in my life, perhaps too many, but I do not think that I ever put so much of what I hope was the best in me as I put in the speech in the conference on the League of Nations in favor of the Monroe Doctrine, and it was upon that occasion that it was embodied. And we have this extraordinary spectacle, of the world recognizing the validity of the Monroe Doctrine. Yet these gentlemen seem to want something more. What more could you get? Shall we get them to express their belief in the deity of the Monroe Doctrine? They accept it for the first time in the history of the world, and they say that they will do nothing that will interfere with it. I must submit that it is absolutely irrational to ask for anything more.

But there is the question of somebody interfering with the domestic policies of the United States—immigration, naturalization, tariffs; matters of that sort. There, again, I can not understand or feel the weight of the difficulty, because the covenant says that if any international difficulty is brought under discussion and one of the parties claims and the council finds that it is a matter of domestic jurisdiction, the council shall cease to discuss it and shall make no report about it. The only way you could make

the document more clear would be by enumerating the domestic questions you had in mind. Very well. I ask any lawyer here if that would be safe? Might you not be in danger of leaving out something? Might you not be in danger of not mentioning something that would afterwards become important? The danger of making a list is that the mention of the things you do mention constitutes the exclusion of the things you do not mention. Inasmuch as there is no dispute of any authoritative students of international law that these matters that we are most concerned about—immigration, naturalization, tariff, and the rest—are domestic questions, it is inconceivable that the council should ever seek to interfere with or to discuss such questions, unless we had ourselves deliberately made them matters of international agreement, and even the opponents of the League admit they would be suitable and proper subjects for discussion.

Those are the matters upon which they are talking about reservations. The only reservations I can imagine are reservations which say over again what the covenant itself says in plain language, and make it necessary that we should go back to Paris and discuss new language for things that we all have to admit, if we are frank, are already in the document.

But there is another matter. Somebody has said that this covenant was an arrangement for the dominance of Great Britain, and he based that upon the fact that in the assembly of the council there are six representatives of the various parts of the British Empire. There are really more than that, because each member of the assembly has three representatives, but six units of the British Empire are represented, whereas the United States is represented as only one unit. Let me be didactic for a moment and tell you how the League is constituted. There is an assembly made up of three members of each of the constituent states, and there is a council. The council is the

only part of the organization that can take effective action. No powers of action rest with the assembly at all, and it is only in the assembly that the British Empire is represented as consisting of six units—for brevity's sake I will say as having six votes. There is only one case when the assembly can vote at all, and that is when the council refers a matter in dispute to the assembly, in which case the assembly can decide a matter by a majority, provided all the representatives of the nations represented in the council vote on the side of the majority. So that, alike, in the assembly and in the council, the one vote of the United States is an absolute veto. I have said that there was only one case upon which the assembly could vote, and that is literally true. The council of the League is made up of one representative from each of the five principal allied and associated powers; that is to say, the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan, and four other nations selected by the assembly of the League. The present members are Spain, Brazil, Belgium, and Greece. In the council is vested all the active powers of the League. Everything that is done by the League is formulated and passed by the council, and a unanimous vote is required. Indeed, my fellow citizens, that is the only thing that seems to me weak about the League; I am afraid that a unanimous vote will sometimes be very difficult to get. The danger is not action, but inaction. The danger is not that they will do something that we do not like, but that upon some critical occasion they will not do anything. If there is any weakness in it, it is the safeguard that has been thrown around the sovereign power of the members of the council. If a matter in controversy arises and one of the parties demands that it shall be taken out of the council and put into the assembly, the council is obliged so to refer it, but in the final vote in the assembly the affirmative action is not valid unless all the States represented in the council shall also in the assembly vote in the affirmative. As we can always veto, always

offset with one vote the British six votes, I must say that I look with perfect philosophy upon the difference in number.

The justification for the representation of more than one part of the British Empire was that the British Empire is made up of semi-independent pieces, as no other Empire in the world is. You know how Canada, for example, passes her own tariff law, does what she pleases to inconvenience the trade of the mother country. Canada's voice in the assembly is merely a debating force. The assembly is a great discussing body. It is a body in which some of the most valuable things that the League is going to do can be done, for I want to ask you, after you have read Article X again, to read XI. Article XI makes it the right of any member of the League, however weak and small, to call attention to anything, anywhere, that is likely to disturb the peace of the world and to draw it into debate, draw it into the open, draw it where everybody can get the facts and talk about it. It is the only time, my fellow countrymen, in the history of the world when weak and oppressed and restive peoples have been given a hearing before the judgment of mankind. Nothing is going to keep this world fit to live in like exposing in public debate every crooked thing that is going on. If you suspect your friend of being a fool, the best way you can prove it or disprove it is by advising him to hire a hall. Then your judgment will be confirmed or reversed by the popular verdict. If you think a policy is good, you will venture to talk about it. If you think it is bad, you will not consent to talk about it. The League of Nations takes everything into the public. It makes every secret agreement of every kind invalid; it provides that no treaty hereafter shall be valid unless registered with the secretary of the League and published. And after bringing everything into the open, it authorizes the assembly to discuss anything that is likely to affect the peace and hap-

piness of the world. In every direction you look the safeguards of this treaty are thrown around those who are oppressed.

Unless America takes part in this treaty, my fellow citizens, the world is going to lose heart. I can not too often repeat to you how deep the impression made upon me upon the other side of the water is that this was the nation upon which the whole world depended to hold the scales of justice even. If we fail them, God help the world! Then despair will ensue. Despair is just at the door on that side of the water now. Men do not hope in Europe as they hope in America. They hope tremblingly. They hope fearfully. They do not hope with confidence and self-reliance as we do on this side of the water. Everywhere in Europe there is that poison of disorder and distrust, and shall we take away from this unsteady world the only thing that reassures it? If we do, then where is the boasted independence of America? Are we indeed independent in our life of the rest of the world? Then why did we go into the war? Germany had not directed her efforts immediately against us. We went in because we were partners with mankind to see that an iniquity was not practiced upon it. You know how we regard the men who fought the Civil War. They did the greatest thing that was to be done in their day. Now, these boys here, and the others like them, have done the greatest thing that it was possible to do in our day. As their fathers saved the Union, they saved the world, and we sit and debate whether we will keep true and finish the job or not! My friends, that debate can not last one minute longer than the moment when this country realizes what it means. It means that, having sent these men to risk their lives and having sent some, whose mothers' hearts can count, to die in France, in order to redeem the world, we, in cool debate, in distant assemblies, say we will not consent that the world should reap the fruit of their vic-

tory! Nothing less than that hangs in the balance. I am ready to fight from now until all the fight has been taken out of me by death to redeem the faith and promises of the United States.

Address at Armory, Tacoma, Wash.

September 13, 1919

Mr. Mayor, Mr. Chairman, Your Excellency, My Fellow Countrymen:

It is with very great pleasure that I find myself in your presence. I have long wanted to get away from Washington and come into contact with the great body of my fellow citizens, because I feel, as I am sure you feel, that we have reached one of the most critical periods in the history of the United States. The shadow of the war is not yet lifted from us, my fellow countrymen, and we have just come out of the depths of the valley of death. I thought that it might be useful if this morning I reminded you of a few things, lest we forget. It is so easy, with the strong tides of our life, to be swept away from one situation into another and to forget the real depths of meaning which lie underneath the things that we are merely touching the surface of. Therefore I thought it would not be impertinent on my part if I asked permission to read you the concluding passage of the address in which I requested the Government of the United States to accept Germany's challenge of war:

"We shall fight," I said, "for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts, for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as will bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free. To such a

task we can dedicate our lives and our fortunes, everything that we are and everything that we have, with the pride of those who know that the day has come when America is privileged to spend her blood and her might for the principles that gave her birth and the happiness and the peace which we have treasured. God helping her, she can do no other."

That is the program we started out on. That is the program which all America adopted without respect of party, and shall we now hesitate to carry it out? Shall we now falter at the very critical moment when we are finally to write our name to the standing pledge which we then took? I want to remind you, my fellow citizens, that many other nations were put under a deeper temptation than we. It would have been possible for little Belgium at any time to make terms with the enemy. Belgium was not prepared to resist. Belgium knew that resistance was useless. Belgium knew that she could get any term of advantage from Germany she pleased, if she would only submit, and at the cost of everything that she had Belgium did nothing less than underwrite civilization. I do not know anywhere in history a more inspiring fact than that. I have seen the fields of Belgium. I have seen great spaces swept of cities and towns as clean as if there had never been anything there except piles of stones; and, farther in, in that beautiful country, the factories are standing, the houses there, but everything that could be useful taken out of the factories; the machinery taken out and shipped to Germany, because Germany feared the competition of the skillful Belgians, and where it was too bulky to take away it was destroyed under the direction of experts—not broken to pieces, but the very part that made it impossible to use it without absolutely destroyed. I have been over great plants there that seemed to the eye to have much of the substantial machinery left, but experts showed me that it could never work again. Belgium lies prostrated be-

cause she fulfilled her pledge to civilization. Italy could have had her terms with Austria at almost any period of the war, particularly just before she made her final stand at the Piave River, but she would not compound with the enemy. She, too, had underwritten civilization. And, my friends, this passage that I have read you, which the whole country accepted as its pledge, is an underwriting of civilization.

In order to let you remember what the thing cost, just let me read you a few figures. If I did not have them on official authority I would deem them incredible. Here is what the war cost. These figures do not include what the different powers loaned each other; they are direct war costs:

It cost Great Britain and her dominions $38,000,000,000; France, $26,000,000,000; the United States, $22,000,000,000; Russia, $18,000,000,000; Italy, $13,000,000,000; a total, including Japan, Belgium and other countries, of $123,000,000,000. It cost the Central Powers: Germany, $39,000,000,000; Austria-Hungary, $21,000,000,000; Turkey and Bulgaria, $3,000,000,000; a total of $63,000,000,000. A grand total of direct war costs of $186,000,000,000—an incredible sum—to save civilization. Now, the question is, Are we going to keep it saved? The expenditures of the United States were at the rate of $1,000,000 an hour, including the night-time, for two years.

The battle deaths—and this is the cost that touches our hearts — were: Russia, 1,700,000; Germany, 1,600,000; France, 1,380,000; Great Britain, 900,000; Austria, 800,000; Italy, 364,000; the United States, 50,300 dead. A total for all belligerents of 7,450,200 men dead on the field of battle! Seven and a half million! The totals for the wounded are not obtainable at present, but the number of torn and wounded for the United States Army was 230,000, excluding, of course, those who were killed. The

total of all battle deaths in all the wars of the world from the year 1793 to 1914 was something under 6,000,000; in all the wars of the world for more than one hundred years fewer men died than have been killed upon the field of battle in the last five years. These are terrible facts, my fellow citizens, and we ought never to forget them. We went into this war to do a thing that was fundamental for the world, and what I have come out upon this journey for is to ascertain whether the country has forgotten it or not. I have found out already. The country has not forgotten, and it never will permit any man who stands in the way of the fulfillment of these great pledges ever to forget the sorrowful day when he made the attempt.

I read you these figures in order to emphasize and set in a higher light, if I may, the substitute which is offered to us, the substitute for war, the substitute for turmoil, the substitute for sorrow and despair. That substitute is offered in the covenant of the League of Nations. America alone can not underwrite civilization. All the great free peoples of the world must underwrite it, and only the free peoples of the world can join the League of Nations. The membership is open only to self-governing nations. Germany is for the present excluded, because she must prove that she is self-governing; she must prove that she has changed the processes of her constitution and the purposes of her policy; but when she has proved these things she can become one of the partners in guaranteeing that civilization shall not suffer again the intolerable thing she attempted. It is not only a union of free peoples to guarantee civilization; it is something more than that. It is a league of nations to advance civilization by substituting something that will make the improvement of civilization possible.

I call you to witness, my fellow citizens, that our present civilization is not satisfactory. It is an industrial civilization, and at the heart of it is an antagonism between

those who labour with their hands and those who direct labour. You can not compose those differences in the midst of war, and you can not advance civilization unless you have a peace of which you make the peaceful and healing use of bringing these elements of civilization together into a common partnership, in which every man will have the same interest in the work of his community that those have who direct the work of the community. We have got to have leisure and freedom of mind to settle these things. This was a war against autocracy; and if you have disorder, if you have disquieted populations, if you have insurgent elements in your population, you are going to have autocracy, because the strongest is going to seize the power, as it has seized it in Russia. I want to declare that I am an enemy of the rulership of any minority, however constituted. Minorities have often been right and majorities wrong, but minorities cease to be right when they use the wrong means to make their opinions prevail. We must have peaceful means; we must have discussion—we must have frank discussion, we must have friendly discussion—and those are the very things that are offered to us among the nations of the world by the covenant of the League of Nations.

I can not too often remind my fellow citizens of what the real heart and center of that covenant is. It lies in the provisions by which every member of the League—and, mind you, that means every great nation in the world, except, for the time being, Germany—solemnly engages never to go to war without first having either submitted the subject to arbitration—in which case it agrees to abide absolutely by the verdict—or submitted it for discussion to the council of the League of Nations, laying all the documents, all the facts, before that council; consenting that the council shall publish all the facts, so as to take the world into its confidence for the formation of a correct judgment concerning it; it agrees that it will allow six months for the

deliberation of the council upon the facts, and that, after those deliberations are concluded, if the advice of the council is not acceptable, it will still not go to war for three months after the rendering of that opinion. In other words, we have the pledge of all the nations of the world that they will sit down and talk everything over that is apt to make trouble amongst them, and that they will talk it over in public, so that the whole illuminating process of public knowledge and public discussion may penetrate every part of the conference. I believe, for my part, that that is a 99 per cent. insurance against war. I take it you want some insurance against war rather than none, and if it is not 99 per cent., I dare say you would like 10 per cent. You would like some insurance rather than none at all, and the experience of the world demonstrates that this is an almost complete insurance.

My fellow citizens, imagine what would have happened if there had been a League of Nations in 1914. What did happen was this: Some time after the Crown Prince of Austria had been assassinated in Serbia, after the world had begun to forget even so tragical an incident, the Austrian Government was prompted by the Government at Berlin to make that the occasion for war. Their thought was, "We are ready. The others are not. Before they can mobilize, before they can bring this matter even under discussion, we will be at their gates. Belgium can not resist. We have promised, solemnly promised, not to cross her territories, but promises are scraps of paper. We will get across her territories into France before France can mobilize. We will make that assassination a pretext." They therefore made unconscionable demands of Serbia, and, notwithstanding the fact that Serbia, with her sense of helplessness, practically yielded to all those demands, they would not even tell the world that she had yielded; they went on with the war. In the meantime every foreign office was telegraphing to its representative at Berlin, beg-

ging that there might be an international conference to see if a settlement could not be effected, and Germany did not dare sit down in conference. It is the common judgment of every statesman I met on the other side of the water that if this thing had been delayed and discussed, not six months, but six days, it never could have happened.

Here we have all the Governments of the world agreeing to discuss anything that is likely to bring about war, because, after that famous Article X there is an Article XI —there are twenty-six articles altogether, although you are not told about any of them except Article X—and Article XI says that it shall be the friendly right of any member of the League, big or little, to bring to the attention of the League—and, therefore, to the attention of the world—anything, anywhere, which is likely to disturb the peace of the world or to disturb the good understanding between nations upon which the peace of the world depends. Wherever there are oppressed nations, wherever there are suffering populations, wherever there is a smoldering flame, the trouble can be uncovered and brought to the bar of mankind, and the whole influence of public opinion the world over will be brought to bear upon it. It is the greatest process of international conference and of international discussion ever conceived, and that is what we are trying to substitute for war. That is what we must substitute for war.

Then, not in immediate connection with the League of Nations covenant but in a later part of the treaty, there is what I have ventured to call the Magna Charta of labour. There is the provision for the constant regular international discussion of labour problems, no matter where they arise in the world, for the purpose of lifting the whole level of labour conditions; for the purpose of safeguarding the health of women and of children, for the sake of bringing about those international comities with regard to labour upon which the happiness of mankind so much depends.

There is a heart in the midst of the treaty. It is not only made by prudent men but it is made by men with hearts under their jackets. I have seen the light of this thing in the eyes of some men whom the world deemed cynical. I have seen men over there, whose emotions are not often touched, with suffused eyes when they spoke of the purposes of this conference, because they realized that, for the first time in the history of mankind, statesmen had got together, not in order to lay plans for the aggrandizement of governments but in order to lay plans for the liberation of peoples; and what I want everybody in every American audience to understand is this: The first effective impulse toward this sort of thing came from America, and I want to call your attention to the fact that it came from some of the very men who are now opposing its consummation. They dreamed the dream that has now been realized. They saw the vision twenty, twenty-five, thirty years ago which all mankind are now permitted to see. It is of particular importance to remember, my fellow citizens, at this moment when some men have dared to introduce party passion into this question, that some of the leading spirits, perhaps I may say the leading spirits, in the conception of this great idea were the leading figures of the great Republican Party. I do not like to mention parties in this discussion. I hope that there is not a real thoughtful, conscientious person in the United States who will determine his or her opinion about this matter with any thought that there is an election in the year 1920. And, just because I want you to realize how absolutely nonpartisan this thing is, I want you to forget, if you please, that I had anything to do with it. I had the great privilege of being the spokesman of this splendid nation at this critical period in her history, but I was her spokesman, not my own, and when I advocated the things that are in this League of Nations I had the full and proud consciousness that I was only expressing the best thought and the best conscience

of my beloved fellow countrymen. The only things that I have any special personal connection with in the League of Nations covenant are things that I was careful to have put in there because of the very considerations which are now being urged. I brought the first draft of the covenant of the League of Nations over to this country in March last. I then held a conference of the frankest sort with the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. They made a number of suggestions as to alterations and additions. I then took all of those suggestions back to Paris, and every one of them, without exception, was embodied in the covenant. I had one or two hard fights to get them in.

You are told, my fellow citizens—it is amazing that anybody should say it—that the covenant does not satisfactorily recognize the Monroe Doctrine. It says in so many words that nothing in that covenant shall be construed as impairing the validity of the Monroe Doctrine. The point is that up to that conference there was not a nation in the world that could be induced to give official recognition to the Monroe Doctrine, and here in this great turn of the tides of the world all the great nations of the world are united in recognizing the Monroe Doctrine. It not only is not impaired, but it has the backing of the world. And at every point where suggestions were made they were accepted; and the suggestions came for the most part from the Republican side of the committee. I say that because I am particularly interested, my fellow citizens, to have you realize that there is no politics in this business, except that profoundly important politics, the politics of civilization. I have the honor to-day of speaking under a chairman who, I understand, is a member of the Republican Party, and every meeting that I have spoken at on this trip, so far as I remember, has been presided over by a Republican. I am saying these things merely because I want to read the riot act to anybody who tries to introduce politics.

Some very interesting things happened while we were on the other side of the water. One of the most distinguished lawyers in the United States, Mr. Wickersham, of New York, who was the Attorney General in Mr. Taft's Cabinet, came over to Europe, I am told—I did not see him while he was over there—to oppose the things that he understood the American Peace Commission was trying to accomplish, and what happened to Mr. Wickersham? He was absolutely converted, above all things else, to the necessity for a league of nations not only, but for this League of Nations. He came back to the United States and has ever since, in season and out of season, been preaching in public advocacy of the adoption of this covenant. I need not tell you of the conspicuously fine work which his chief, Mr. Taft, has been doing in the same cause. I am very proud, my fellow citizens, to be associated with these gentlemen. I am very proud to forget party lines, because there is one thing that is so much greater than being a Republican or a Democrat that those names ought never to be mentioned in connection with, and that is being an American. There is only one way to be an American, and that is to fulfill the pledges that we gave the world at our birth, that we have given the world at every turn in our history, and that we have just now sealed with the blood of some of our best young men.

There is something in this country that is not anywhere else in the world. There is a confident looking forward to better times. There is a confidence that we can work out the most difficult problems. There is none of that heavy leaden discouragement that rests upon some other countries. Have you never crossed the seas in times of peace and noticed the immigrants who were going back to visit their folks, and then, on the return voyage, the immigrants who were coming in for the first time—the extraordinary contrast in the appearance of the two groups? The group going out, having felt the atmosphere of America, their

faces bright, a sort of a sense of initiative about it, having been freed to be men and individuals; and those coming back, bearing all sorts of queer bundles, looking a bit anxious, just a little doubtful of the hope with which they are looking forward to the new country. It is the alchemy, the miracle of America, and it is the only country in the world, so far as my observation goes, where that miracle is wrought, and the rest of the world knows that. The rest of the world implores America's aid—not her material aid; they are not looking for our dollars; they are not looking for our guns. They are saying, "Show us the road that led you out of the wilderness and made you great, for we are seeking that road." Now that the great treaty of peace has established the oppressed peoples of the world who were affected by this treaty on their own territory, given them their own freedom, given them command of their own affairs, they are looking to America to show them how to use that new liberty and that new power.

When I was at that wonderful stadium of yours a few minutes ago, a little child, a little girl in white, came and presented me with some kind of a paper—I have not had time to read it yet—from the Poles. I dare say that it is of the sort that I have received a great many of—just an expression of a sort of childlike and piuiful thanks that America assisted to free Poland. Poland never could have freed herself. We not only tore Germany's hands away from where she meant to make ravage of the rights of the others, but we took those old peoples who had been under her power before and said, "You could not free yourselves, but we believe in liberty. Here is your own land to do with as you please." I wish that some of the men who are opposing this treaty could get the vision in their hearts of all it has done. It has liberated great populations. It has set up the standards of right and of liberty for the first time, where they were never unfurled before, and then has placed back of them this splendid power of the nations

combined. For without the League of Nations the whole thing is a house of cards. Just a breath of power will blow it down. Whereas with the League of Nations it is as strong as Gibraltar. Let them catch this vision; let them take in this conception; let them take counsel of weeping mothers; let them take counsel of bereaved fathers who used to have their sons at their sides and are now alone; let them take counsel of the lonely farms where there used to be a boy to help the old man, and now he can not even get a hired man to help him, and yet he is trying to feed the world; let them realize that the world is hungry, that the world is naked, that the world is suffering, and that none of these things can be remedied until the minds of men are reassured. That is the fundamental fact, my fellow citizens.

It is a pitiful spectacle that the great bodies of our fellow citizens should be arrayed against each other. One of the most startling things that I ever realized was, months and months ago, when I was trying to moderate and assist in settling some of the difficulties between the railroads and their employees. I asked the representatives of the railway brotherhoods to come to the White House, and I asked the presidents of the great railway systems to come to the White House, and I found that each side had a profound suspicion of the other, that the railway presidents were not willing to trust what their men said and the men were not willing to trust what the railway presidents said. When I took over the railroads in the name of the Government, I said to a group of fine-spirited men, a group of railway presidents, who were trying to unify the administration of the railroads for the purposes of the war—I said, smilingly, but with a little sadness, "Well, at any rate, gentlemen, these men will trust me, and they do not trust you." I did not say it with pride; I said it with sorrow. I did not know whether I could justify their trust or not, but I did know that I was willing to talk things over with them whenever

anything was the matter, and that if we were equally intelligent and equally conscientious we could get together whenever anything went wrong. I could not help suspecting that this distrust, this mutual distrust, was the wedge that was being driven into society, and society can not live with a great wedge at the heart of it. Society can not get on industrially or socially, with any such wedge driven into its heart. We must see that the processes of peace, the processes of discussion, the processes of fairness, the processes of equity, the processes of sympathy penetrate all our affairs. I have never known anybody who had a good cause who was unwilling to discuss it. Whenever I find a man standing out stiffly against consulting with the other side, I know his case is bad.

It has been a privilege, my fellow citizens, to make this simple presentation of a great theme to you, and I am happy in carrying away with me recollections of the generous response you have made to a plea which I can only characterize as a plea which has come from the heart of a true American.

Address at Arena, Seattle, Wash.

September 13, 1919

Mr. Chairman, My Fellow Countrymen:

All over this country, my fellow citizens, it is becoming more and more evident that those who were the partisans of Germany are the ones who are principally pleased by some of the aspects of the debate that is now going on. The world outside of America is asking itself the question, "Is America going to stand by us now, or is it at this moment of final crisis going to draw apart and desert us?" I can answer that question here and now. It is not going to draw apart and it is not going to desert the nations of

the world. America responds to nothing so quickly or unanimously as a great moral challenge. It is much more ready to carry through what now lies before it than it was even to carry through what was before it when we took up arms in behalf of the freedom of the world. America is unaccustomed to military tasks, but America is accustomed to fulfilling its pledges and following its visions. The only thing that causes me uneasiness, my fellow countrymen, is not the ultimate outcome, but the impressions that may be created in the meantime by the perplexed delay. The rest of the world believed absolutely in America and was ready to follow it anywhere, and it is now a little chilled. It now asks, "Is America hesitating to lead? We are ready to give ourselves to her leadership. Why will she not accept the gift?"

My fellow citizens, I think that it is my duty, as I go about the country, not to make speeches in the ordinary acceptance of that word, not to appeal either to the imagination or to the emotion of my fellow citizens, but to undertake everywhere what I want to undertake to-night, and I must ask you to be patient while I undertake it. I want to analyze for you what it is that it is proposed we should do. Generalities will not penetrate to the heart of this great question. It is not enough to speak of the general purposes of the peace. I want you to realize just what the covenant of the League of Nations means. I find that everywhere I go it is desirable that I should dwell upon this great theme, because in so many parts of the country men are drawing attention to little details in a way that destroys the whole perspective of the great plan in a way that concentrates attention upon certain particulars which are incidental and not central. I am going to take the liberty of reading you a list of the things which the nations adhering to the covenant of the League of Nations undertake. I want to say by way of preface that it seems to me, and I am sure it will seem to you, not only an extraordi-

narily impressive list, but a list which was never proposed for the counsels of the world before.

In the first place, every nation that joins the League, and that in prospect means every great fighting nation in the world, agrees to submit all controversies which are likely to lead to war either to arbitration or to thorough discussion by an authoritative body, the council of the League of Nations. These great nations, all the most ambitious nations in the world except Germany, all the most powerful nations in the world, as well as the weak ones—all the nations that we have supposed had imperialistic designs—say that they will do either one or other of two things in case a controversy arises which can not be settled by ordinary diplomatic correspondence: They will either frankly submit it to arbitration and absolutely abide by the arbitral verdict or they will submit all the facts, all the documents, to the council of the League of Nations, will give the council six months in which to discuss the whole matter and leave to publish the whole matter, and at the end of the six months will still refrain for three months more from going to war, whether they like the opinion of the council or not. In other words, they agree to do a thing which would have made the recent war with Germany absolutely impossible. If there had been a League of Nations in 1914, whether Germany belonged to it or not, Germany never would have dared to attempt the aggression which she did attempt, because she would have been called to the bar of the opinion of mankind and would have known that if she did not satisfy that opinion mankind would unite against her. You had only to expose the German case to public discussion to make certain that the German case would fall and that Germany would not dare to act upon it. It was the universal opinion on the the other side of the water when I was over there that if Germany had thought that England would be added to France and Russia she never would have gone in, and if

she had dreamed that America would throw her mighty weight into the scale it would have been inconceivable. The only thing that reassured the deluded German people after we entered the war was the lying statement of her public men that we could not get our troops across the sea, because Germany knew if America got within striking distance the story was done. Here all the nations of the world, except Germany, for the time being at any rate, give notice that they will unite against any nation that has a bad case, and they agree that in their own case they will submit to prolonged discussion.

There is nothing so chilling as discussion to a hot temper. If you are fighting mad and yet I can induce you to talk it over for half an hour, you will not be fighting mad at the end of the half hour. I knew a very wise schoolmaster in North Carolina who said that if any boy in that school fought another, except according to the rules, he would be expelled. There would not be any great investigation; the fact that he had fought would be enough; he would go home; but if he was so mad that he had to fight, all he had to do was to come to the head master and tell him that he wanted to fight. The head master would arrange the ring, would see that the fight was conducted according to the Marquis of Queensberry rules, that an umpire and a referee were appointed, and that the thing was fought to a finish. The consequence was that there were no fights in that school. The whole arrangement was too cold-blooded. By the time all the arrangements had been made all the fighting audacity had gone out of the contestants. That little thing illustrates a great thing. Discussion is destructive when wrong is intended; and all the nations of the world agree to put their case before the judgment of mankind. Why, my fellow citizens, that has been the dream of thoughtful reformers for generation after generation. Somebody seems to have conceived the notion that I originated the idea of a league of nations.

I wish I had. I would be a very proud man if I had; but I did not. I was expressing the avowed aspirations of the American people, avowed by nobody so loudly, so intelligently, or so constantly as the greater leaders of the Republican party. When Republicans take that road, I take off my hat and follow; I do not care whether I lead or not. I want the great result which I know is at the heart of the people that I am trying to serve.

In the second place, all these great nations agree to boycott any nation that does not submit a perilous question either to arbitration or to discussion, and to support each other in the boycott. There is no "if" or "but" about that in the covenant. It is agreed that just so soon as that member state, or any outside state, for that matter, refuses to submit its case to the public opinion of the world its doors will be closed and locked; that nobody shall trade with it, no telegraphic message shall leave it or enter it, no letter shall cross its borders either way; there shall be no transactions of any kind between the citizens of the members of the League and the covenant-breaking state. That is the remedy that thoughtful men have advocated for several generations. They have thought, and thought truly, that war was barbarous and that a nation that resorted to war when its cause was unjust was unworthy of being consorted with by free people anywhere. The boycott is an infinitely more terrible instrument of war. Excepting our own singularly fortunate country, I can not think of any other country that can live upon its own resources. The minute you lock the door, then the pinch of the thing becomes intolerable; not only the physical pinch, not only the fact that you can not get raw materials and must stop your factories, not only the fact that you can not get food and your people must begin to starve, not only the fact that your credit is stopped, that your assets are useless, but the still greater pinch that comes when a nation knows that it is sent to Coventry and despised. To be put in jail is

not the most terrible punishment that happens to a condemned man; if he knows that he was justly condemned, what penetrates his heart is the look in other men's eyes. It is the soul that is wounded much more poignantly than the body, and one of the things that the German nation has not been able to comprehend is that it has lost for the time being the respect of mankind; and as Germans, when the doors of truth were opened to them after the war, have begun to realize that they have begun to look aghast at the probable fortunes of Germany, for if the world does not trust them, if the world does not respect them, if the world does not want Germans to come as immigrants any more, what is Germany to do? Germany's worst punishment, my fellow citizens, is not in the treaty; it is in her relations with the rest of mankind for the next generation. The boycott is what is substituted for war.

In the third place, all the members of this great association pledge themselves to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of the other member States. That is the famous Article X that you hear so much about; and Article X, my fellow citizens, whether you want to assume the responsibility of it or not, is the heart of the pledge that we have made to the other nations of the world. Only by that article can we be said to have underwritten civilization. The wars that threaten mankind begin by that kind of aggression. For every other nation than Germany, in 1914, treaties stood as solemn and respected covenants. For Germany they were scraps of paper, and when her first soldier's foot fell upon the soil of Belgium her honor was forfeited. That act of aggression, that failure to respect the territorial integrity of a nation whose territory she was specially bound to respect, pointed the hand along that road that is strewn with graves since the beginning of history, that road made red and ugly with the strife of men, the strife behind which lies savage cupidity, the strife

behind which lies a disregard for the rights of others and a thought concentrated upon what you want and mean to get. That is the heart of war, and unless you accept Article X you do not cut the heart of war out of civilization.

Belgium did not hesitate to underwrite civilization. Belgium could have had safety on her own terms if only she had not resisted the German arms—little Belgium, helpless Belgium, ravaged Belgium. Ah, my fellow citizens, I have seen some of the fields of Belgium. I rode with her fine, democratic king over some of those fields. He would say to me, "This is the village of so and so," and there was no village there, just scattered stones all over the plain, and the plain dug deep every few feet with the holes made by exploding shells. You could not tell whether it was the earth thrown up or the house thrown down that made the débris which covered the desert made by the war. Then we rode farther in, farther to the east, where there had been no fighting, no active campaigning, and there we saw beautiful green slopes and fields that had once been cultivated, and towns with their factories standing, but standing empty; not empty of workers merely, empty of machinery. Every piece of machinery in Belgium that they could put on freight cars the Germans had taken away, and what they could not carry with them they had destroyed, under the devilishly intelligent direction of experts—great bodies of heavy machinery that never could be used again, because somebody had known where the heart of the machine lay and where to put the dynamite. The Belgians are there, their buildings are there, but nothing to work with, nothing to start life with again; and in the face of all that Belgium did not flinch for a moment to underwrite the interests of mankind by saying to Germany, "We will not be bought."

Italy could have had more by compounding with Austria in the later stages of the war than she is going to get out of the peace settlement now, but she would not compound.

She also was a trustee for civilization, and she would not sell the birthright of mankind for any sort of material advantage. She underwrote civilization. And Serbia, the first of the helpless nations to be struck down, her armies driven from her own soil, maintained her armies on other soil, and the armies of Serbia were never dispersed. Whether they could be on their own soil or not, they were fighting for their rights and through their rights for the rights of civilized man.

I believe that America is going to be more willing than any other nation in the world, when it gets its voice heard, to do the same thing that these little nations did. Why, my fellow citizens, we have been talking constantly about the rights of little nations. There is only one way to maintain the rights of little nations, and that is by the strength of great nations. Having begun this great task, we are no quitters; we are going to see the thing through. The red that this German counsellor of state saw upon the horizon was not the red of any dawn that will reassure the people who attempted the wrong that Germany did. It was the first red glare of the fire that is going to consume the wrong in the world. As that moral fire comes creeping on, it is going to purify every field of blood upon which free men sacrified their lives; it is going to redeem France, redeem Belgium, redeem devastated Serbia, redeem the fair lands in the north of Italy, and set men on their feet again, to look fate in the face and have again that hope which is the only thing that leads men forward.

In the next place, every nation agrees to join in advising what shall be done in case any one of the members fails to keep that promise. There is where you have been misled, my fellow citizens. You have been led to believe that the council of the League of Nations could say to the Congress of the United States, "Here is a war, and here is where you come in." Nothing of the sort is true. The council of the League of Nations is to advise what is to be done,

and I have not been able to find in the dictionary any meaning of the word "advise," except "to advise." But let us suppose that it means something else; let us suppose that there is some legal compulsion behind the advice. The advice can not be given except by a unanimous vote of the council and an affirmative vote of the United States. We will be a permanent member of the council of the League of Nations, and no such advice is ever going to be given unless the United States votes "aye," with one exception. If we are parties to the dispute, we can not vote; but, my fellow citizens, let me remind you that if we are parties to the dispute, we are in the war anyhow, so that we are not forced into war by the vote of the council, we are forced into war by our quarrel with the other party, as we would be in any case. There is no sacrifice in the slightest degree of the independent choice of the Congress of the United States whether it will declare war or not. There is a peculiar impression on the part of some persons in this country that the United States is more jealous of its sovereignty than other countries. That provision was not put in there because it was necessary to safeguard the sovereignty of the United States. All the other nations wanted it, and they were just as keen for their veto as we were keen for our veto. There is not the slightest danger that they will misunderstand that article of the covenant. There is only a danger that some of us who are too credulous will be led to misunderstand it.

All the nations agree to join in devising a plan for general disarmament. You have heard that this covenant was a plan for bringing on war. Well, it is going to bring on war by means of disarmament and also by establishing a permanent court of international justice. When I voted for that, I was obeying the mandate of the Congress of the United States. In a very unexpected place, namely, in a naval appropriation bill passed in 1915, it was declared to be the policy of the United States to bring about a gen-

eral disarmament by common agreement, and the President of the United States was requested to call a conference not later than the close of the then present war for the purpose of consulting and agreeing upon a plan for a permanent court of international justice; and he was authorized, in case such an agreement could be reached, to stop the building program provided for by that naval appropriation bill. The Congress of the United States deliberately not only accepted but directed the President to promote an agreement of this sort for disarmament and a permanent court of international justice. You know what a permanent court of international justice implies. You can not set up a court without respecting its decrees. You can not make a toy of it. You can not make a mockery of it. If you, indeed, want a court, then you must abide by the judgments of the court. And we have declared already that we are willing to abide by the judgments of a court of international justice.

All the nations agree to register every treaty, and they agree that no treaty that is not registered and published shall be valid. All private agreements and secret treaties are swept from the table, and thereby one of the most dangerous instruments of international intrigue and disturbance is abolished.

They agree to join in the supervision of the government of helpless and dependent people. They agree that no nation shall hereafter have the right to annex any territory merely because the people that live on it can not prevent it, and that instead of annexation there shall be trusteeship, under which these territories shall be administered under the supervision of the associated nations of the world. They lay down rules for the protection of dependent peoples of that sort, so that they shall not have enforced labour put upon them, so that their women and children shall be protected from unwholesome and destructive forms of labour, so that they will be kept away from

the opium traffic and the traffic in arms. They agree that they will never levy armies there. They agree, in other words, to do what no nation ever agreed to do before, to treat subject nations like human beings.

They agree also to accord and maintain fair and humane conditions of labour for men, women, and children born in their own countries and in all other countries to which their commercial and industrial relations extend, and for that purpose they agree to join in establishing and maintaining the necessary international organization. This great treaty, which we are hesitating to ratify, contains the organization by which the united counsels of mankind shall attempt to lift the levels of labour and see that men who are working with their hands are everywhere treated as they ought to be treated, upon principles of justice and equality. How many labouring men dreamed, when this war began, that four years later it would be possible for all the great nations of the world to enter into a covenant like that? They agree to intrust the League with the general supervision of all international agreements with regard to traffic in women and children and traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs. They agree to intrust the League with the general supervision of the trade in arms and ammunition with the countries in which the control of this traffic is necessary in the common interest. They agree to join in making provision to secure and maintain freedom of communication and of transit and equitable treatment for commerce in respect of all the members of the League. They agree to cooperate in the endeavor to take steps for the prevention and control of disease. They agree to encourage and promote the establishment and cooperation of duly authorized voluntary national Red Cross organizations for the improvement of health, the prevention of disease, and the mitigation of suffering throughout the world.

I ask you, my fellow citizens, is that not a great peace

document and a great human document? And is it conceivable that America, the most progressive and humane nation in the world, should refuse to take the same responsibility upon herself that all the other great nations take in supporting this great covenant? You say, "It is not likely that the treaty will be rejected. It is only likely that there will be certain reservations." Very well, I want very frankly to tell you what I think about that. If the reservations do not change the treaty, then it is not necessary to make them part of the resolution of ratification. If all that you desire is to say what you understand the treaty to mean, no harm can be done by saying it; but if you want to change the treaty, if you want to alter the phraseology so that the meaning is altered, if you want to put in reservations which give the United States a position of special privilege or a special exemption from responsibility among the members of the League, then it will be necessary to take the treaty back to the conference table, and, my fellow citizens, the world is not in a temper to discuss this treaty over again. The world is just now more profoundly disturbed about social and economic conditions than it ever was before, and the world demands that we shall come to some sort of settlement which will let us get down to business and purify and rectify our own affairs. This is not only the best treaty that can be obtained, but I want to say, because I played only a small part in framing it, that it is a sound and good treaty, and America, above all nations, should not be the nation that puts obstacles in the way of the peace of nations and the peace of mind of the world.

The world has not anywhere at this moment, my fellow citizens, peace of mind. Nothing has struck me so much in recent months as the unaccustomed anxiety on the face of people. I am aware that men do not know what is going to happen, and that they know that it is just as important to them what happens in the rest of the world,

almost, as what happens in America. America has connections with all the rest of the world not only, but she has necessary dealings with all the rest of the world, and no man is fatuous enough to suppose that if the rest of the world is disturbed and disordered, the disturbance and disorder are not going to extend to the United States. The center of our anxiety, my fellow citizens, is in that pitiful country to which our hearts go out, that great mass of mankind whom we call the Russians. I have never had the good fortune to be in Russia, but I know many persons who know that lovable people intimately, and they all tell me that there is not a people in the world more generous, more simple, more kindly, more naturally addicted to friendship, more patiently attached to peace than the Russian people. Yet, after throwing off the grip of terror that an autocratic power of the Czar had upon them, they have come under a terror even greater than that; they have come under the terror of the power of men whom nobody knows how to find. One or two names everybody knows, but the rest is intrigue, terror, informing, spying, and military power, the seizure of all the food obtainable in order that the fighting men may be fed and the rest go starved. These men have been appealed to again and again by the civilized governments of the world to call a constituent assembly, let the Russian people say what sort of government they want to have; and they will not, they dare not, do it. That picture is before the eyes of every nation. Shall we get into the clutch of another sort of minority? My fellow citizens, I am going to devote every influence I have and all the authority I have from this time on to see to it that no minority commands the United States. [Great and continued applause.] It heartens me, but it does not surprise me, to know that that is the verdict of every man and woman here; but, my fellow citizens, there is no use passing that verdict unless we are going to take part, and a great part, a leading

part, in steadying the counsels of the world. Not that we are afraid of anything except the spread of moral defection, and moral defection can not come except where men have lost faith, lost hope, have lost confidence; and, having seen the attitude of the other peoples of the world toward America, I know that the whole world will lose heart unless America consents to show the way.

ADDRESS AT LUNCHEON, HOTEL PORTLAND, PORTLAND, ORE.

SEPTEMBER 15, 1919

Mr. Jackson, Ladies and Gentlemen:

As I return to Portland I can not help remembering that I learned a great deal in Oregon. When I was a teacher I used to prove to my own satisfaction—I do not know whether it was to the satisfaction of my classes or not—that the initiative and referendum would not work. I came to Oregon to find that they did work, and have since been apologizing for my earlier opinion. Because I have always taken this attitude toward facts, that I never let them get me if I see them coming first. There is nothing I respect so much as a fact. There is nothing that is so formidable as a fact, and the real difficulty in all political reform is to know whether you can translate your theories into facts or not, whether you can safely pick out the operative ideas and leave aside the inoperative ideas. For I think you will all agree with me that the whole progress of human affairs is the progress of ideas; not of ideas in the abstract form, but of ideas in the operative form, certain conceptions of justice and of freedom and of right that have got into men's natures and led those natures to insist upon the realization of those ideas in experience and in action.

The whole trouble about our civilization as it looks to me, is that it has grown complex faster than we have adjusted the simpler ideas to the existing conditions. There was a time when men would do in their business what they would not do as individuals. There was a time when they submerged their individual consciences in a corporation and persuaded themselves that it was legitimate for a corporation to do what they individually never would have dreamed of doing. That is what I mean by saying that the organization becomes complex faster than our adjustment of the simpler ideas of justice and right to the developing circumstances of our civilization. I say that because the errand that I am on concerns something that lies at the heart of all progress. I think we are all now convinced that we have not reached the right and final organization of our industrial society; that there are many features of our social life that ought to undergo correction; that while we call ourselves democrats—with a little "d"—while we believe in democratic government, we have not seen yet the successful way of making our life in fact democratic; that we have allowed classes to disclose themselves; that we have allowed lines of cleavage to be run through our community, so that there are antagonisms set up that breed heat, because they breed friction. The world must have leisure and order in which to see that these things are set right, and the world can not have leisure and order unless it has a guaranteed peace.

For example, if the United States should conceivably—I think it inconceivable—stay out of the League of Nations, it would stay out at this cost: We would have to see, since we were not going to join our force with other nations, that our force was formidable enough to be respected by other nations. We would have to maintain a great Army and a great Navy. We would have to do something more than that: We would have to concentrate authority sufficiently to be able to use the physical force

of the Nation quickly upon occasion. All of that is absolutely antidemocratic in its influence. All of that means that we should not be giving ourselves the leisure of thought or the release of material resources necessary to work out our own methods of civilization, our own methods of industrial organization and production and distribution; and our problems are exactly the problems of the rest of the world. I am more and more convinced, as I come in contact with the men who are trying to think for other countries as we are trying to think for this one, that our problems are identical, only there is this difference: Peoples of other countries have lost confidence in their Governments. Some of them have lost confidence in their form of government. That point, I hope and believe, has not been reached in the United States. We have not lost confidence in our Government. I am not now speaking of our administration; I am now thinking of our method of government. We believe that we can manage our own affairs and that we have the machinery through which we can manage our own affairs, and that no clique or special interest is powerful enough to run away with it. The other countries of the world also believe that about us. They believe that we are successfully organized for justice, and they therefore want us to take the lead and they want to follow the lead. If we do not take the lead, then we throw them back upon things in which they have no confidence and endanger a universal disorder and discontent in the midst of which it will be impossible to govern our own affairs with success and with constant achievement. Whether you will or not, our fortunes are tied in with the rest of the world, and the choice that we have to make now is whether we will receive the influences of the rest of the world and be affected by them or dominate the influences of the world and lead them. That is a tremendous choice to make, but it is exactly that tremendous choice that we have to make, and I deeply regret the sug-

gestions which are made on some sides that we should take advantage of the present situation in the world but should not shoulder any of the responsibility. Do you know of any business or undertaking in which you can get the advantage without assuming the responsibility? What are you going to be? Boys running around the circus tent and peeping under the canvas? Men declining to pay the admission and sitting on the roof and looking on the game? Or are you going to play your responsible part in the game, knowing that you are trusted as leader and umpire both?

Nothing has impressed me more, or impressed me more painfully, if I may say so, than the degree in which the rest of the world trusts us and looks to us. I say "painfully" because I am conscious that they are expecting more than we can perform. They are expecting miracles to be wrought by the influence of the American spirit on the affairs of the world, and miracles can not be wrought. I have again and again recited to my fellow citizens on this journey how deputations from peoples of every kind and every color and every fortune, from all over the world, thronged to the house in which I was living in Paris to ask the guidance and assistance of the United States. They did not send similar delegations to anybody else, and they did not send them to me except because they thought they had heard in what I had been saying the spirit of the American people uttered. Moreover, you must not forget this, that almost all of them had kinsmen in America. You must not forget that America is made up out of all the world and that there is hardly a race of any influence in the world, at any rate hardly a Caucasian race, that has not scores and hundreds, and sometimes millions, of people living in America with whom they are in correspondence, from whom they receive the subtle suggestions of what is going on in American life, and of the ideals of American life. Therefore they feel that they know America from this contact they have had with us, and they

want America to be the leading force in the world. Why, I received delegations there speaking tongues that I did not know anything about. I did not know what family of languages they belonged to, but fortunately for me they always brought an interpreter along who could speak English, and one of the significant facts was that the interpreter was almost always some young man who had lived in America. He did not talk English to me; he talked American to me. So there always seemed to be a little link of some sort tying them up with us, tying them up with us in fact, in relationship, in blood, as well as in life, and the world will be turned back to cynicism if America goes back on it.

We dare not go back on it. I ask you even as a business proposition whether it is more useful to trade with a cynic or with an optimist. I do not like to trade with a man with a grouch. I do not like to trade with a man who begins by not believing anything I am telling him. I like to trade with a man who is more or less susceptible to the eloquence which I address to him. A salesman has a much longer job if he approaches a grouch than if he approaches a friend. This trivial illustration illustrates, my fellow citizens, our relation to the rest of the world. If we do not do what the rest of the world expects of us, all the rest of the world will have a grouch toward America, and you will find it a hard job to reestablish your credit in the world. And back of financial credit lies mental credit. There is not a bit of credit that has not got an element of assessment of character. You do not limit your credit to men who can put up the collateral, who have the assets; you extend it also to the men in whose characters and abilities you believe; you think they are going to make good. Your credit is a sort of bet on their capacity, and that is the largest element in the kind of credit that expands enterprise. The credit that merely continues enterprise is based upon asset and past accom-

plishment, but the credit that expands enterprise is based upon your assessment of character. If you are going to put into the world this germ, I shall call it, of American enterprise and American faith and American vision, then you must be the principal partners in the new partnership which the world is forming.

I take leave to say, without intending the least disrespect to anybody, that, consciously or unconsciously, a man who opposes that proposition either has no imagination or no knowledge, or is a quitter. America has put her hand to this great enterprise already, in the men she sent overseas, and their part was the negative part merely. They were sent over there to see that a malign influence did not interfere with the just fortunes of the world. They stopped that influence, but they did not accomplish anything constructive, and what is the use clearing the table if you are going to put nothing on it? What is the use clearing the ground if you are not going to erect any building? What is the use of going to the pains that we went to, to draw up the specifications of the new building and then saying, "We will have nothing to do with its erection"? For the specifications of this treaty were American specifications, and we have got not only to be the architects, drawing up the specifications, but we have got to be the contractors, too. Isn't it a job worth while? Isn't it worth while, now that the chance has at last come, in the providence of God, that we should demonstrate to the world that America is what she claimed that she was? Every drop of blood that I have in me gets up and shouts when I think of the opportunity that America has.

Address at Auditorium, Portland, Ore.

September 15, 1919

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Irvine, My Fellow Countrymen:

The task, that great and gallant task, which our soldiers performed is only half finished. They prevented a great wrong. They prevented it with a spirit and a courage and with an ability that will always be written on the brightest pages of our record of gallantry and of force. I do not know when I have been as proud, as an American, as when I have seen our boys deploy on the other side of the sea. On Christmas Day last, on an open stretch of country, I saw a great division march past me, with all the arms of the service, walking with that swing which is so familiar to our eyes, with that sense of power and confidence and audacity which is so characteristic of America, and I seemed to see the force that had saved the world. But they merely prevented something. They merely prevented a particular nation from doing a particular, unspeakable wrong to civilization, and their task is not complete unless we see to it that it has not to be done over again; unless we fulfill the promise which we made to them and to ourselves that this was not only a war to defeat Germany, but a war to prevent the recurrence of any such wrong as Germany had attempted; that it was a war to put an end to the wars of aggression forever.

There is only one means of doing that, my fellow citizens. I found quoted in one of your papers the other day a passage so apposite that I do not know that I can do better than read it as the particular thing that it is now necessary to do:

> Nations must unite as men unite in order to preserve peace and order. The great nations must be so united as to be able to say to any single country, "You must not go to war," and they can say that effectively when the country desiring war knows that the force which the united nations place behind peace is irresistible. In dif-

ferences between individuals the decision of a court is final, because in the last resort the entire force of the community is behind the court decision. In differences between nations which go beyond the limited range of arbitral questions, peace can only be maintained by putting behind it the force of united nations determined to uphold it and prevent war.

That is a quotation from an address said to have been delivered at Union College in June, 1915, a year after the war began, by Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts. I entirely concur in Senator Lodge's conclusion, and I hope I shall have his cooperation in bringing about the desired result. In other words, the only way we can prevent the unspeakable thing from happening again is that the nations of the world should unite and put an irresistible force behind peace and order. There is only one conceivable way to do that, and that is by means of a league of nations. The very description is a definition of a league of nations, and the only thing that we can debate now is whether the nations of the world, having met in a universal congress and formulated a covenant as the basis for a league of nations, we are going to accept that or insist upon another. I do not find any man anywhere rash or bold enough to say that he does not desire a league of nations. I only find men here and there saying that they do not desire this League of Nations, and I want to ask you to reflect upon what that means. And in order to do that I want to draw a picture for you, if you will be patient with me, of what occurred in Paris.

In Paris were gathered the representatives of nearly thirty nations from all over the civilized globe, and even from some parts of the globe which in our ignorance of them we have not been in the habit of regarding as civilized, and out of that great body were chosen the representatives of fourteen nations, representing all parts of the great stretches of the peoples of the world which the conference as a whole represented. The representatives of those fourteen nations were constituted a commission

on the League of Nations. The first resolution passed by the conference of peace in Paris was a resolution in favor of a league of nations, setting up a commission to formulate a league of nations. It was the thought foremost in the minds of every statesman there. He knew that his errand was in vain in Paris if he went away without achieving the formation of a league of nations, and that he dared not go back and face his people unless he could report that the efforts in that direction had been successful. That commission sat day after day, evening after evening. I had the good fortune to be a member of the commission, and I want to testify to the extraordinary good temper in which the discussions were conducted. I want to testify that there was a universal endeavor to subordinate as much as possible international rivalries and conflicting international interests and come out upon a common ground of agreement in the interest of the world. I want to testify that there were many compromises, but no compromises that sacrificed the principle, and that although the instrument as a whole represented certain mutual concessions, it is a constructive instrument and not a negative instrument. I shall never lose so long as I live the impression of generous, high-minded, statesmanlike cooperation which was manifested in that interesting body. It included representatives of all the most powerful nations, as well as representatives of some of those that were less powerful.

I could not help thinking as I sat there that the representatives of Italy spoke as it were in the tones of the long tradition of Rome; that we heard the great Latin people who had fought, fought, fought through generation after generation of strife down to this critical moment, speaking now in the counsels of peace. And there sat the prime minister of Greece—the ancient Greek people—lending his singular intelligence, his singularly high-minded and comprehensive counsel, to the general result.

There were the representatives also of France, our ancient comrade in the strife of liberty. And there were the representatives of Great Britain, supposed to be the most ambitious, the most desirous of ruling the world of any of the nations of the world, cooperating with a peculiar interest in the result, with a constant and manifestly sincere profession that they wanted to subordinate the interests of the British Empire, which extended all over the world, to the common interests of mankind and of peace. The representatives of Great Britain I may stop to speak of for a moment. There were two of them. One of them was Lord Robert Cecil, who belongs to an ancient family in Great Britain, some of the members of which—particularly Lord Salisbury of a past generation—had always been reputed as most particularly keen to seek and maintain the advantage of the British Empire; and yet I never heard a man to speak whose heart was evidently more in the task of the humane redemption of the world than Lord Robert Cecil. And alongside of him sat General Smuts, the South African Boer, the man who had fought Great Britain so successfully that, after the war was over and the Boers nominally defeated, Great Britain saw that the wisest thing she could do was to hand the government of the country over to the Boers themselves. General Botha and General Smuts were both members of the peace conference; both had been successful generals in fighting the British arms. Nobody in the conference was more outspoken in criticizing some aspects of British policy than General Botha and General Smuts, and General Smuts was of the same mind with Lord Robert Cecil. They were both serving the common interests of free people everywhere. You seem to see a sort of epitome of the history of the world in that conference. There were nations that had long been subordinated and suffering. There were nations that had been indomitably free but, nevertheless, not so free that they could really accomplish the

objects that they had always held dear. I want you to realize that this conference was made up of many minds and of many nations and of many traditions, keen to the same conclusion, with a unanimity, an enthusiasm, a spirit which speaks volumes for the future hopes of mankind.

When this covenant was drawn up in its first form I had the occasion—for me the very happy occasion—to return for a week or so to this country in March last. I brought the covenant in its first draft. I submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the House. We discussed all parts of the document. Many suggestions were made. I took all of those suggestions with me back to Paris, and the conference on the League of Nations adopted every one of the suggestions made. No counsels were listened to more carefully or yielded to more willingly in that conference than the counsels of the United States. Some things were put into the covenant which, personally, I did not think necessary, which seemed to me to go without saying, but which they had no objection to putting in there explicitly.

For example, take the Monroe Doctrine. As a matter of fact, the covenant sets up for the world a Monroe Doctrine. What is the Monroe Doctrine?. The Monroe Doctrine is that no nation shall come to the Western Hemisphere and try to establish its power or interfere with the self-government of the peoples in this hemisphere; that no power shall extend its governing and controlling influence in any form to either of the Americas. Very well; that is the doctrine of the covenant. No nation shall anywhere extend its power or seek to interfere with the political independence of the peoples of the world; and inasmuch as the Donroe Doctrine had been made the universal doctrine, I did not think that it was necessary to mention it particularly, but when I suggested that it was the desire of the United States that it should be explicitly

recognized, it was explicitly recognized, for it is written in there that nothing in the covenant shall be interpreted as affecting the validity of the Monroe Doctrine. The Monroe Doctrine is left intact, and the United States is left free to enforce it.

That is only a sample. The members of the Foreign Relations Committee and of the Committee on Foreign Affairs did not see it anywhere explicitly stated in the covenant that a member of the League could withdraw. I told them that the matter had been discussed in the commission on the league and that it had been the universal opinion that, since it was a combination of sovereigns, any sovereign had the right to withdraw from it; but when I suggested that that would be explicitly put in, no objection was made whatever, and at the suggestion of the United States it was explicitly provided that any member of the league could withdraw. Provision was made that two years' notice should be given, which I think everybody will recognize as perfectly fair, so that no nation is at liberty suddenly to break down this thing upon which the hope of mankind rests; but with that limitation and with the provision that when they withdraw they shall have fulfilled all their international obligations they are perfectly free to withdraw. When gentlemen dwell upon that provision, that we must have fulfilled all our international obligations, I answer all their anxieties by asking them another question. "When did America ever fail to fulfill her international obligations?" There is no judge in the matter set up in the covenant, except the conscience of the withdrawing nation and the opinion of mankind, and I for one am proud enough American to dismiss from my mind all fear of at any time going before the judgment of mankind on the conduct of the United States, knowing that we will go with clean hands and righteous purpose.

I am merely illustrating now the provisions that were put in at the suggestion of the United States. Without

exception, the suggestions of the United States were adopted, and I want to say, because it may interest you, that most of these suggestions came from Republican sources. I say that, my fellow citizens, not because it seems to me to make the least difference among Americans in a great matter like this which party such things came from, but because I want to emphasize in every discussion of this matter the absolutely nonpartisan character of the covenant and of the treaty. I am not in favor of the ratification of this treaty, including the covenant of the League of Nations, because I am a Democrat. I am in favor of it because I am an American and a lover of humanity. If it will relieve anybody's mind, let me add that it is not my work, that practically every portion of the covenant of the League of Nations emanates from counsels running back ten, twenty, thirty years, among the most thoughtful men in America, and that it is the fulfilment of a dream which five years ago, when the war began, would have been deemed unattainable. What we are discussing ought not to be disfigured, ought not to be tainted, with the least thought of domestic politics. If anybody in this audience allows himself when thinking of this matter to think of the elections of 1920 I want to declare that I separate myself from him.

I draw all this picture of the care with which the covenant was drawn up, every phrase scrutinized, every interest considered, the other nations at the board just as jealous of their sovereignty as we could possibly be of ours, and yet willing to harness all of these sovereignties in a single great enterprise of peace, and how the whole thing was not the original idea of any man in the conference, but had grown out of the counsels of hopeful and thoughtful and righteous men all over the world; because just as there was in America a League to enforce peace, which even formulated a constitution for the league of peace before the conference met, before the conference was thought of, before

the war began, so there were in Great Britain and in France and in Italy and, I believe, even in Germany similar associations of equally influential men, whose ideal was that some time there might come an occasion when men would be sane enough and right enough to get together to do a thing of this great sort. I draw that picture in order to show you the other side of what is going on, and I want to preface this part by saying that I hope you will not construe anything that I say as indicating the least lack of respect for the men who are criticizing any portion of this treaty. For most of them, I have reason to have respect, for I have come into close contact and consultation with them. They are just as good Americans as I claim to be; they are just as thoughtful of the interests of America as I try to be; they are just as intelligent as anybody who could address his mind to this thing; and my contest with them is a contest of interpretation, not a contest of intention. All I have to urge with those men is that they are looking at this thing with too critical an eye as to the mere phraseology, without remembering the purpose that everybody knows to have been in the minds of those who framed it, and that if they go very far in attempting to interpret it by resolutions of the Senate they may, in appearance at any rate, sufficiently alter the meaning of the document to make it necessary to take it back to the council board. Taking it back to the council board means, among other things, taking it back to Germany; and I frankly tell you, my fellow citizens, it would sit very ill upon my stomach to take it back to Germany. Germany, at our request—I may say almost at our dictation—signed the treaty and has ratified it. It is a contract, so far as her part in it is concerned. I can testify that we tried to be just to Germany, and that when we had heard her arguments and examined every portion of the counter-proposals that she made, we wrote the treaty in its final form and then said, "Sign here." What else did our boys

die for? Did they die in order that we might ask Germany's leave to complete our victory? They died in order that we might say to Germany what the terms of victory were in the interest of justice and of peace, and we were entitled to take the course that we did take. I can only beg these gentlemen in their criticism of the treaty and in their action in the Senate not to go so far as to make it necessary to ask the consent of the other nations to the interpretations which they are putting upon the treaty. I have said in all frankness that I do not see a single phrase in the covenant of the League of Nations which is of doubtful meaning, but if they want to say what that undoubted meaning is, in other words that do not change the undoubted meaning, I have no objection. If they change the meaning of it, then all the other signatories have to consent; and what has been evident in the last week or two is that on the part of some men, I believe a very few, the desire is to change the treaty, and particularly the covenant, in a way to give America an exceptional footing.

One of the things that gave the world a new and bounding hope was that the great United States had said that it was fighting for the little nation as well as the great nation; that it regarded the rights of the little nation as equal to its own rights; that it would make no distinction between free men everywhere; that it was not fighting for a special advantage for the United States but for an equal advantage for all free men everywhere. Let gentlemen beware, therefore, how they disappoint the world. Let gentlemen beware how they betray the immemorial principles of the United States. Let men not make the mistake of claiming a position of privilege for the United States which gives it all the advantages of the League of Nations and none of the risks and responsibilities. The principle of equity everywhere is that along with a right goes a duty; that if you claim a right for yourself and must be ready to support that right for somebody else; that if you

claim to be a member in a society of any sort you must not claim the right to dodge the responsibilities and avoid the burden, but you must carry the weight of the enterprise along with the hope of the enterprise. That is the spirit of free men everywhere, and that I know to be the spirit of the United States.

Our decision, therefore, my fellow citizens, rests upon this. If we want a league of nations, we must take this League of Nations, because there is no conceivable way in which any other league of nations is obtainable. We must leave it or take it. I should be very sorry to have the United States indirectly defeat this great enterprise by asking for something, some position of privilege, which other nations in their pride can not grant. I would a great deal rather say flatly, "She will not go into the enterprise at all." And that, my fellow citizens, is exactly what Germany is hoping and beginning to dare to expect. I am not uttering a conjecture; I am speaking of knowledge, knowledge of the things that are said in the German newspapers and by German public men. They are taking heart because the United States, they hope, is not going to stand with the other free nations of the world to guarantee the peace that has been forced upon them. They see the hope that there will be two nations standing outside the League —Germany and the United States. Germany because she must; the United States because she will. She knows that that will turn the hostility and enmity of all the other nations of the world against the United States, as their hostility is already directed against her. They do not expect that now the United States will in any way align themselves with Germany. They do not expect the sympathy of the United States to go out to them now, but they do expect the isolation of the United States to bring about an alienation between the United States and the other free nations of the world, which will make it impossible for the world ever to combine again against such enterprises

as she was defeated in attempting. All over this country pro-German propaganda is beginning to be active again, beginning to try to add to the force of the arguments against the League in particular and against the treaty and the several items of the treaty. And the poison of failure is being injected into the whole fine body politic of the united world, a sort of paralysis, a sort of fear. Germany desires that we should say, "What have we created? A great power which will bring peace, but will that power be amiable to us? Can we control that power?" We can not control it for any but its proper purpose—the purpose of righteousness and peace—but for that purpose we are invited to control it by the opinion of mankind, for all over the world peoples are looking to us with confidence, our rivals along with the weaker nations. They believe in the honesty of purpose and the indomitable rectitude of purpose of the United States, and they are willing to have us lead.

I pray God that the gentlemen who are delaying this thing may presently see it in a different light. I fain would appeal to their hearts. I wonder if they have forgotten what this war meant. I wonder if they have had mothers who lost their sons take them by their hand, as they have taken my own, and looked things that their hearts were too full to speak, praying me to do all in my power to save the sons of other mothers from this terrible thing again. I had one fine woman come to me and say as steadily as if she were saying a commonplace, "I had the honor to lose a son in the war." How fine that is—"I had the honor to sacrifice a son for the redemption of mankind!" And yet there is a sob back of the statement, there is a tear brushed hastily away from a cheek. A woman came up to the train the other day and seized my hand and was about to say something when she turned away in a flood of tears. I asked a standerby what was the matter, and he said, "Why, sir, she lost a son in France." Mind you, she did not turn

away from me. I ordered her son overseas. I advised the Congress of the United States to sacrifice that son. She came to me as a friend. She had nothing in her heart except the hope that I could save other sons, though she had given hers gladly, and, God helping me, I will save other sons. Through evil report and good report, through resistance and misrepresentation and every other vile thing, I shall fight my way to that goal. I call upon the men to whom I have referred—the honest, patriotic, intelligent men, who have been too particularly concerned in criticizing the details of that treaty—to forget the details, to remember the great enterprise, to stand with me, and fulfill the hopes and traditions of the United States.

ADDRESS AT LUNCHEON, PALACE HOTEL, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

SEPTEMBER 17, 1919

Mrs. Mott and My Fellow Citizens:

Mrs. Mott has very happily interpreted the feeling with which I face this great audience. I have come to get a consciousness of your support and of your sentiment, at a time in the history of the world, I take leave to say, more critical than has ever been known during the history of the United States, I have felt a certain burden of responsibility as I have mixed with my fellow countrymen across the continent, because I have feared at times that there were those amongst us who did not realize just what the heart of this question is. I have been afraid that their thoughts were lingering in a past day when the calculation was always of national advantage, and that it had not come to see the light of the new day in which men are thinking of the common advantage and safety of mankind. The issue is nothing else. Either we must stand apart, and

in the phrase of some gentlemen, "take care of ourselves," which means antagonize others, or we must join hands with the other great nations of the world and with the weak nations of the world, in seeing that justice is everywhere maintained.

Quite apart from the merits of any particular question that may be raised about the treaty itself, I think we are under a certain moral compulsion to accept this treaty. In the first place, my fellow citizens, it was laid down according to American specifications. The initial suggestions upon which this treaty is based emanated from America. I would not have you understanding me as meaning that they were ideas confined to America, because the promptness with which they were accepted, the joy with which they were hailed in some parts of the world, the readiness of the leaders of nations that had been supposed to be seeking chiefly their own interest in adopting these principles as the principles of the peace, show that they were listening to the counsels of their own people, that they were listening to those who knew the critical character of the new age and the necessity we were under to take new measures for the peace of the world. Because the thing that had happened was intolerable. The things that Germany attempted, if it had succeeded, would have set the civilization of the world back a hundred years. We have prevented it, but prevention is not enough. We have shown Germany—and not Germany only, but the world—that upon occasion the great peoples of the world will combine to prevent an iniquity, but we have not shown how that is going to be done in the future with a certainty that will make every other nation know that a similar enterprise must not be attempted.

The moral compulsion upon us, upon us who at the critical stage of the world saved the world and who threw in our fortunes with all the forward-looking peoples of the world—the moral compulsion upon us to stand by and see

it through is overwhelming. We can not now turn back. We made the choice in April, 1917. We can not with honor reverse it now.

Not only is there the compulsion of honor, but there is the compulsion of interest. I never like to speak of that, because, notwithstanding the reputation that we had throughout the world before we made the great sacrifice of this war, this Nation does love its honor better than it loves its interest. It does yield to moral compulsion more readily than to material compulsion. That is the glory of America. That is the spirit in which she was conceived and born. That is the mission that she has in the world. She always has lived up to it, and, God helping her, she always will live up to it. But if you want, as some of our fellow countrymen insist, to dwell upon the material side of it and our interest in the matter, our commercial interest, draw the picture for yourselves. The other nations of the world are drawing together. We who suggested that they should draw together in this new partnership stand aside. We at once draw their suspicion upon us. We at once draw their intense hostility upon us. We at once renew the thing that had begun to be done before we went into the war. There was a conference in Paris not many months before we went into the war in which the nations then engaged against Germany attempted to draw together in an exclusive economic combination where they should serve one another's interest and exclude those who had not participated in the war from sharing in that interest, and just so certainly as we stay out, every market that can possibly be closed against us will be closed. If you merely look at it from the point of view of the material prosperity of the United States, we are under compulsion to stay in the partnership. I was asking some gentlemen the other day who were engaged in commerce of various sorts, "Can you sell more easily to a man who trusts you or to a man who distrusts you?" There can be

but one answer to that question. Can you sell more easily to a man who takes your goods because he can not do without them or to a man who wants them and believes them the best? The thing demonstrates itself. You make all the lines of trade lines of resistance unless you prove true to the things that you have attempted and undertaken.

Then, there is a deeper compulsion even than those, the compulsion of humanity. If there is one thing that America ought to have learned more promptly than any other country it is that, being made up out of all the ranks of humanity, in serving itself it must serve the human race. I suppose I could not command the words which would exaggerate the present expectations of the world with regard to the United States. Nothing more thrilling, nothing more touching, happened to me on the other side of the water than the daily evidences that, not the weak peoples merely, not the peoples of countries that had been allowed to shift for themselves and had always borne the chief burden of the world's sufferings, but the great peoples as well, the people of France as well as the people of Serbia, the people of all the nations that had loooked this terror in the face, were turning to the United States and saying, "We depend upon you to take the lead, to direct us how to go out of this wilderness of doubt and fear and terror." We can not desert humanity. We are the trustees of humanity, and we must see that we redeem the pledges which are always implicit in so great a trusteeship.

So, feeling these compulsions, the compulsion of honor, the compulsion of interest, and the compulsion of humanity, I wonder what it is that is holding some minds back from acquiescence in this great enterprise of peace. I must admit to you, my fellow citizens, that I have been very much puzzled. I can not conceive a motive adequate to hold men off from this thing, and when I examine the objections which they make to the treaty I can but wonder if they are really thinking, or if, on the other hand, there is some

emotion coming from fountains that I do not know of which are obliging them to take this course.

Let me take the point in which my initial sympathy is most with them, the matter of the cession to Japan of the interests of Germany in Shantung, in China. I said to my Japanese colleagues on the other side of the sea, and therefore I am at liberty to say in public, I am not satisfied with that settlement, I think it ought to have been different, but when gentlemen propose to cure it by striking that clause out of the treaty or by ourselves withholding our adherence to the treaty, they propose an irrational thing. Let me remind you of some of the history of this business. It was in 1898 that China ceded these rights and concessions to Germany. The pretext was that some German missionaries had been killed. My heart aches, I must say, when I think how we have made an excuse of religion sometimes to work a deep wrong. The central Government of China had done all that they could to protect those German missionaries; their death was due to local disturbances, to local passion, to local antipathy against the foreigner. There was nothing that the Chinese Government as a whole could justly be held responsible for; but suppose there had been. Two Christian missionaries are killed, and therefore one great nation robs another nation and does a thing which is fundamentally un-Christian and heathen! For there was no adequate excuse for what Germany exacted of China. I read again only the other day the phrases in which poor China was made to make the concessions. She was made to make them in words dictated by Germany, in view of her gratitude to Germany for certain services rendered—the deepest hypocrisy conceivable! She was obliged to do so by force.

Then, what happened, my fellow citizens? Then Russia came in and obliged China to cede to her Port Arthur and Talien Wan, not for quite so long a period, but upon substantially the same terms. Then England must needs have

Wei-hai-wei as an equivalent concession to that which had been made to Germany; and presently certain ports, with the territory back of them, were ceded upon similar principles to France. Everybody got in, except the United States, and said, "If Germany is going to get something, we will get something." Why? None of them had any business in there on such terms.

Then when the Japanese-Russian War came, Japan did what she has done in this war. She attacked Port Arthur and captured Port Arthur, and Port Arthur was ceded to her as a consequence of the war. Not one official voice was raised the United States against that cession. No protest was made. No protest was made by the Government of the United States against the original cession of this Shantung territory to Germany. One of the highest minded men of our history was President at that time—I mean Mr. McKinley. One of the ablest men that we have had as Secretary of State, Mr. John Hay, occupied that great office. In the message of Mr. McKinley about this transaction, he says—I am quoting his language—that inasmuch as the powers that had taken these territories had agreed to keep the door open there for our commerce, there was no reason why we should object. Just so we could trade with these stolen territories we were willing to let them be stolen. Which of these gentlemen who are now objecting to the cession of the German rights in Shantung to Japan were prominent in protesting against the original cession or any one of those original cessions? It makes my heart burn when some men are so late in doing justice.

In the meantime, before we got into this war, but after the war had begun, because they deemed the assistance of Japan in the Pacific absolutely indispensable, Great Britain and France both agreed that if Japan would enter and cooperate in the war she could do the same thing with regard to Shantung that she had done with regard to Port Arthur; that is she would take what Germany had in China

and she could keep it. She took it. She has it now. Her troops are there. She has it as spoils of war. Observe, my fellow citizens, we are not taking this thing away from China; we are taking it from Germany. China had ceded it for ninety-nine years, and there are seventy-eight of those ninety-nine to run yet. They were Germany's rights in Shantung, not China's, that were ceded by the treaty to Japan, but with a difference—a difference which never occurred in any of these other cases—a difference which was not insisted upon at the cession of Port Arthur—upon a condition that no other nation in doing similar things in China has ever yielded to. Japan is under solemn promise to forego all sovereign rights in the Province of Shantung and to retain only what private corporations have elsewhere in China, the right of concessionaires with regard to the operation of the railway and the exploitation of the mines. Scores of foreign corporations have that right in other parts of China.

But it does not stop there. Coupled with this arrangement is the League of Nations, under which Japan solemnly undertakes, with the rest of us, to protect the territorial integrity of China, along with the territorial integrity of other countries, and back of her promise lies the similar promise of every other nation, that nowhere will they countenance a disregard for the territorial integrity or the political independence of that great helpless people, lying there hitherto as an object of prey in the great Orient. It is the first time in the history of the world that anything has been done for China, and sitting around our council board in Paris I put this question: "May I expect that this will be the beginning of the retrocession to China of the exceptional rights which other Governments have enjoyed there?" The responsible representatives of the other great Governments said, "Yes; you may expect it." Expect it?

Your attention is constantly drawn to Article X, and that is the article—the heart of the covenant—which

guarantees the territorial integrity and political independence not only of China, but of other countries more helpless even than China; but besides Article X, there is Article XI, which makes it the right of every member of the League, big or little, influential or not influential, to draw attention to anything, anywhere, that is likely to disturb the peace of the world or the good understanding between nations upon which the peace of the world depends. Whenever formerly anything was done in detriment of the interests of China, we had to approach the Government that did it with apologies. We had, as it were, to say, "This is none of our business, but we would like to suggest that this is not in the interest of China." I am repeating, not the words but the purport of notes that I have signed myself to Japan, in which I was obliged to use all the genuflections of apology and say, "The United States believes that this is wrong in principle and suggests to the Japanese Government that the matter be reconsidered." Now, when you have the League of Nations the representative of the United States has the right to stand up and say, "This is against the covenants of peace; it can not be done," and if occasion arises we can add, "It shall not be done." The weak and oppressed and wronged peoples of the world have never before had a forum made for them in which they can summon their enemies into the presence of the judgment of mankind, and if there is one tribunal that the wrongdoer ought to dread more than another it is that tribunal of the opinion of mankind. Some nations keep their international promises only because they wish to obtain the respect of mankind. You remember those immortal words in the opening part of the Declaration of Independence. I wish I could quote them literally, but they run this way, that out of respect for the opinion of mankind the leaders of the American Revolution now state the causes which have led them to separate themselves from Great Britain. America was the first to set that example,

the first to admit that right and justice and even the basis of revolution was a matter upon which mankind was entitled to form a judgment.

If we do not take part in this thing, what happens? France and England are absolutely bound to this thing without any qualifications. The alternative is to defend China in the future with important concessions to begin with, or else let the world go back to its old methods of rapacity; or else take up arms against France and England and Japan, and begin the shedding of blood over again, almost fratricidal blood. Does that sound like a practical program? Does that sound like doing China a service? Does that sound like anything that is rational?

Go to other matters with which I have less patience, other objections to the League. I have spoken of Article X. Those who object to Article X object to entering the League with any responsibilities whatever. They want to make it a matter of opinion merely and not a matter of action. They know just as well as I know that there is nothing in Article X that can oblige the Congress of the United States to declare war if it does not deem it wise to declare war. We engage with the other nations of the world to preserve as against external aggression—not as against internal revolution—the territorial integrity and existing political independence of the other members of the League; and then in the next sentence, it is said that the council of the League of Nations shall advise with regard to the measures which may be necessary to carry out this promise on the part of the members. As I have said several times in my speeches, I have in vain searched the dictionary to find any other meaning for the word "advise" than "advise." These gentlemen would have you believe that our armies can be ordered abroad by some other power or by a combination of powers. They are thinking in an air-tight compartment. America is not the only proud nation in the world. I can testify from my share in the counsels on the

other side of the sea that the other nations are just as jealous of their sovereignty as we are of ours. They would no more have dreamed of giving us the right of ordering out their armies than we would have dreamed of giving them the right to order out our armies. The advice can come from the United States only after the United States representative votes in the affirmative.

We have got an absolute veto on the thing, unless we are parties to the dispute, and I want again to call attention to what that means. That means unless we want to seize somebody's territory or invade somebody's political independence, or unless somebody else wants to seize our territory and invade our political independence. I regard either of those contingencies as so remote that they are not troubling me in the least. I know the people of this country well enough to know that we will not be the aggressors in trying to execute a wrong, and in looking about me I do not see anybody else that would think it wise to try it on us. But suppose we are parties. Then is it the council of the League that is forcing war upon us? The war is ours anyhow. We are in circumstances where it is necessary for Congress, if it wants to steal somebody's territory or prevent somebody from stealing our territory, to go to war. It is not the council of the League that brings us into war at that time, in such circumstances; it is the unfortunate circumstances which have arisen in some matter of aggression. I want to say again that Article X is the very heart of the covenant of the League, because all the great wrongs of the world have had their root in the seizure of territory or the control of the political independence of other peoples. I believe that I speak the feeling of the people of the United States when I say that, having seen one great wrong like that attempted and having prevented it, we are ready to prevent it again.

I brought the first draft of the covenant to this country in March last. I then invited the Foreign Affairs Com-

mittee of the House and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate to the White House to dinner, and after dinner we had the frankest possible conference with regard to this draft. When I went back to Paris I carried every suggestion that was made in that conference to the commission on the League of Nations, which consisted of representatives of fourteen nations, and every one of the suggestions of those committees was embodied in the document. I suppose it is a pride of style. I suppose, that although the substance was embodied, they would rather write it differently, but, after all, that is a literary matter. After all, that is a question of pride in the command of the English language, and I must say that there were a great many men on that commission on the League of Nations who seemed perfectly to understand the English language and who wished to express, not only in the English text but in its French equivalent, exactly what we wanted to say.

One of the suggestions I carried over was that we should have the right to withdraw. I must say that I did not want to say, "We are going into this if you promise we can scuttle whenever we want to." That did not seem to me a very handsome thing to propose, and I told the men in the conference at the White House, when they raised the question, that it had been raised in the commission on the League of Nations and that it was the unanimous opinion of the international lawyers of that body that, inasmuch as this was an association of sovereigns, they had the right to withdraw. But I conceded that if that right was admitted there could be no harm in stating it, and so in the present draft of the covenant it is stated that any member may withdraw upon two years' notice, which, I think, is not an unreasonable length of time, provided that at the end of the two years all the international obligations of that power under the covenant shall have been fulfilled. Would you wish any other condition? Would you wish the

United States allowed to withdraw without fulfilling its obligations? Is that the kind of people we are? Moreover, have we ever failed to fulfill our international obligations? It is a point of pride with me, my fellow citizens, not to debate this question. I will not debate with anybody whether the United States is likely to withdraw without fulfilling its obligations or not, and if other gentlemen entertain that possibility and expectation, I separate myself from them.

But there is another matter. They say that the British Empire has six votes and we have only one. It happens that our one is as big as the six, and that satisfies me entirely. Let me explain what I mean. It is only in the assembly that the British Empire has six votes—not in the council—and there is only one thing that the assembly votes on in which it can decide a matter without the concurrence of all the states represented on the council, and that is the admission of new members to the League of Nations. With regard to every other matter, for example, amendments to the covenant, with regard to cases referred out of the council to the assembly, it is provided that if a majority of the assembly and the representatives of all the states represented on the council concur, the vote shall be valid and conclusive, which means that the affirmative vote of the United States is in every instance just as powerful as the six votes of the British Empire. I took the pains yesterday, I believe it was, on the train, to go through the covenant almost sentence by sentence again, to find if there was any case other than the one I have mentioned in which that was not true, and there is no other case in which that is not true. Of course, you will understand that wherever the United States is a party to a quarrel and that quarrel is carried to the assembly, we can not vote; but, similarly, if the British Empire is a party her six representatives can not vote. It is an even break any way you take it, and I would rather count six as one person than six as six per-

sons. So far as I can see, it makes me a bigger man. The point to remember is that the energy of the League of Nations resides in the council, not in the assembly, and that in the council there is a perfect equality of votes. That settles that matter, and even some of my fellow countrymen who insist upon keeping a hyphen in the middle of their names ought to be satisfied with that. Though I must admit that I do not care to argue anything with a hyphen. A man that puts anything else before the word "American" is no comrade of mine, and yet I am willing even to discomfit him with a statement of fact.

Those are the objections to yielding to these compulsions of honor, interest, and humanity, and it is because of the nature of these objections, their flimsiness, the impossibility of supporting them with conclusive argument that I am profoundly puzzled to know what is back of the opposition to the League of Nations. I know one of the results, and that is to raise the hope in the minds of the German people that, after all, they can separate us from those who were our associates in the war. I know that the pro-German propaganda which had theretofore not dared to raise its head again has now boldly raised its head and is active all over the United States. These are disturbing and illuminating circumstances. Pray understand me; I am not accusing some of the honorable men whose objections I am trying to answer with trying to draw near to Germany. That is not my point; but I am saying that what they are attempting to do is exactly what Germany desires, and that it would touch the honor of the United States very near if at the end of this great struggle we should seek to take the position which our enemies desire and our friends deplore.

I am arguing the matter only because I am a very patient man. I have not the slightest doubt as to what the result is going to be. I have felt the temper and high purpose of this great people as I have crossed this wonder-

ful land of ours, and one of the things that make it most delightful to stand here is to remember that the people of the Pacific coast were the first to see the new duty in its entirety. It is a remarkable circumstance that you people, who were farthest from the field of conflict, most remote from that contract of interests which stirred so many peoples, yet outdid the rest of the country in volunteering for service and volunteering your money.

ADDRESS AT AUDITORIUM, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

SEPTEMBER 17, 1919.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Rolph, My Fellow Countrymen:

I have come before you to discuss a very serious theme. I want to analyze for you the very important issue with which this nation is now face to face. It is by far the most important question that has ever come before this people for decision, and the reason I have come out upon this long journey is that I am conscious that it is the people, their purpose, their wish, that is to decide this thing, and not the thought of those who are planning any private purpose of their own.

What I first want to call your attention to, my fellow citizens, is this: You know that the debate in which we are engaged centers first of all upon the League of Nations, and there seems to have arisen an idea in some quarters that the League of Nations is an idea recently conceived, conceived by a small number of persons, somehow originated by the American representatives at the council table in Paris. Nothing could be further from the truth than that. I would not feel the confidence that I feel in the League of Nations if I felt that it was so recent and novel a growth and birth as that. On the contrary, it is the fruit of many generations of thoughtful, forward-looking men,

not only in this country but in the other countries of the world, who have been able to look forward to the combined fortunes of mankind. The men who have conceived this great purpose are not men who through these generations, when they were concerting counsel in this great matter, thought of the fortunes of parties, thought of the fortunes of individuals. I would be ashamed of myself, as I am frankly ashamed of any fellow countryman of mine who does it, if I discussed this great question with any portion of my thought devoted to the contest of parties and the elections of next year.

Some of the greatest spirits, some of the most instructed minds of both parties have been devoted to this great idea for more than a generation. It has come before the Paris conference out of the stage of ideal conception. It had long before that begun to assume the shape of a definite program and plan for the concert and cooperation of the nations in the interest of the peace of the world, and when I went to Paris I was conscious that I was carrying there no plan which was novel either to America or to Europe, but a plan which all statesmen who realized the real interests of their people had long ago hoped might be carried out in some day when the world would realize what the peace of the world meant and what were its necessary foundations. When I got to Paris I was not conscious of presenting anything that they had not long considered, and I felt that I was merely the spokesman of thoughtful minds and hopeful spirits in America. I was not putting forward any purpose of my own. So that I beg you will dismiss any personal appearance or personal relationship which this great plan may bear. I would indeed be a very proud man if I had personally conceived this great idea, but I can claim no such honor. I can only claim the privilege of having been the obedient servant of the great ideals and purposes of beloved America.

I want you to realize, my fellow countrymen, that those

Americans who are opposing this plan of the League of Nations offer no substitute. They offer nothing that they pretend will accomplish the same object. On the contrary, they are apparently willing to go back to that old and evil order which prevailed before this war began and which furnished a ready and fertile soil for those seeds of envy which sprung up like dragon's teeth out of the bloody soil of Europe. They are ready to go back to that old and ugly plan of armed nations, of alliances, of watchful jealousies, of rabid antagonisms, of purposes concealed, running by the subtle channels of intrigue through the veins of people who do not dream what poison is being injected into their systems. They are willing to have the United States stand alone, withdraw from the concert of nations; and what does that mean, my fellow citizens? It means that we shall arm as Germany was armed, that we shall submit our young men to the kind of constant military service that the young men of Germany were subjected to. It means that we shall pay not lighter but heavier taxes. It means that we shall trade in a world in which we are suspected and watched and disliked, instead of in a world which is now ready to trust us, ready to follow our leadership, ready to receive our traders, along with our political representatives as friends, as men who are welcome, as men who bring goods and ideas for which the world is ready and for which the world has been waiting. That is the alternative which they offer.

It is my purpose, fellow citizens, to analyze the objections which are made to this great League, and I shall be very brief. In the first place, you know that one of the difficulties which have been experienced by those who are objecting to this League is that they do not think that there is a wide enough door open for us to get out. For my own part, I am not one of those who, when they go into a generous enterprise, think first of all how they are going to turn away from those with whom they are associated. I am

not one of those who, when they go into a concert for the peace of the world, want to sit close to the door with their hand on the knob and constantly trying the door to be sure that it is not locked. If we want to go into this thing—and we do want to go into it—we will go in it with our whole hearts and settled purpose to stand by the great enterprise to the end. Nevertheless, you will remember—some of you, I dare say—that when I came home in March, for an all too brief visit to this country, which seems to me the fairest and dearest in the world, I brought back with me the first draft of the covenant of the League of Nations. I called into consultation the Committees on Foreign Affairs and on Foreign Relations of the House and Senate of the United States, and I laid the draft of the covenant before them. One of the things that they proposed was that it should be explicitly stated that any member of the League should have the right to withdraw. I carried that suggestion back to Paris, and without the slightest hesitation it was accepted and acted upon; and every suggestion which was made in that conference at the White House was accepted by the conference of peace in Paris. There is not a feature of the covenant, except one, now under debate upon which suggestions were not made at that time, and there is not one of those suggestions that was not adopted by the conference of peace.

The gentlemen say, "You have laid a limitation upon the right to withdraw. You have said that we can withdraw upon two years' notice, if at that time we shall have fulfilled all our international obligations and all our obligations under the covenant." "Yes," I reply; "is it characteristic of the United States not to fulfill her international obligations? Is there any fear that we shall wish to withdraw dishonorably? Are gentlemen willing to stand up and say that they want to get out whether they have the moral right to get out or not?" I for one am too proud as an American to debate that subject on that basis. The

United States has always fulfilled its international obligations, and, God helping her, she always will. There is nothing in the covenant to prevent her acting upon her own judgment with regard to that matter. The only thing she has to fear, the only thing she has to regard, is the public opinion of mankind, and inasmuch as we have always scrupulously satisfied the public opinion of mankind with regard to justice and right, I for my part am not afraid at any time to go before that jury. It is a jury that might condemn us if we did wrong, but it is not a jury that could oblige us to stay in the League, so that there is absolutely no limitation upon our right to withdraw.

They are nervous about domestic questions. They say, "It is intolerable to think that the League of Nations should interfere with domestic questions," and whenever they begin to specify they speak of the question of immigration, of the question of naturalization, of the question of the tariff. My fellow citizens, no competent or authoritative student of international law would dream of maintaining that these were anything but exclusively domestic questions, and the covenant of the League expressly provides that the League can take no action whatever about matters which are in the practice of international law regarded as domestic questions. We did not undertake to enumerate samples of domestic questions for the very good reason, which will occcur to any lawyer, that if you made a list it would be inferred that what you left out was not included. Nobody with a thoughtful knowledge of international practice has the least doubt as to what are domestic questions, and there is no obscurity whatever in this covenant with regard to the safeguarding of the United States, along with other sovereign countries, in the control of domestic questions.

It is objected that the British Empire has six votes and we have one. The answer to that is that it is most carefully arranged that our one vote equals the six votes of the Brit-

ish Empire. Anybody who will take the pains to read the covenant of the League of Nations will find out that the assembly—and it is only in the assembly that the British Empire has six votes—is not a voting body. There is a very limited number of subjects upon which it can act at all, and I have taken the pains to write them down here, after again and again going through the covenant for the purpose of making sure that I had not omitted anything, in order that I might give you an explicit account of the thing. There are two things which a majority of the assembly may do without the concurrent vote of the United States. A majority of the assembly can admit a new member to the League of Nations. A majority of the assembly can recommend to any nation a member of the League a reconsideration of such treaties as are apparently in conflict with the provisions of the covenant itself; it can advise any member of the League to seek a reconsideration of any international obligation which seems to conflict with the covenant itself, but it has no means whatever of obliging it to reconsider even so important a matter as that, which is obviously a moral duty on the part of any member of the League. All the action, all the energy, all the initiative, of the League of Nations is resident in the council, and in the council a unanimous vote is necessary for action, and no action is possible without the concurrent vote of the United States. I would rather, personally, as one man count for six than be six men and count only six. The United States can offset six votes. Here are the cases: When a matter in dispute is referred by the council to the assembly its action must be taken by a majority vote of the assembly, concurred in by the representatives of all the governments represented in the council, so that the concurrence of the vote of the United States is absolutely necessary to an affirmative vote of the assembly itself. In the case of an amendment to the covenant it is necessary that there should be a unanimous vote of the representatives of the

nations which are represented in the council in addition to a majority vote of the assembly itself. And there is all the voting that the assembly does.

Not a single affirmative act or negative decision upon a matter of action taken by the League of Nations can be validated without the vote of the United States of America. We can dismiss from our dreams the six votes of the British Empire, for the real underlying conception of the assembly of the League of Nations is that it is the forum of opinion, not of action. It is the debating body; it is the body where the thought of the little nation along with the thought of the big nation is brought to bear upon those matters which affect the peace of the world, is brought to bear upon those matters which affect the good understanding between nations upon which the peace of the world depends; where this stifled voice of humanity is at last to be heard, where nations that have borne the unspeakable sufferings of the ages that must have seemed to them like æons will find voice and expression, where the moral judgment of mankind can sway the opinion of the world. That is the function of the assembly. The assembly is the voice of mankind. The council, where unanimous action is necessary, is the only means through which that voice can accomplish action.

You say, "We have heard a great deal about Article X." I just now said that the only substitute for the League of Nations which is offered by the opponents is a return to the old system. What was the old system? That the strong had all the rights and need pay no attention to the rights of the weak; that if a great powerful nation saw what it wanted, it had the right to go and take it; that the weak nations could cry out and cry out as they pleased and there would be no hearkening ear anywhere to their rights. I want to bring in another subject connected with this treaty, but not with the League of Nations, to illustrate what I am talking about. You have heard a great deal about the

cession to Japan of the rights which Germany had acquired in Shantung Province in China. What happened under the old order of things, my fellow citizens? The story begins in 1898. Two German missionaries were killed in China by parties over whom the Central Government of China was unable to exercise control. It was one of those outbreaks, like the pitiful Boxer rebellion, where a sudden hatred of foreigners wells up in the heart of a nation uninformed, aware of danger, aware of wrong, but not knowing just how to remedy it, not knowing just what was the instrumentality of right. And, my fellow citizens, why should not the Chinaman hate the foreigner? The foreigner has always taken from him everything that he could get. When by irresponsible persons these German missionaries were murdered, the German Government insisted that a great part of the fair Province of Shantung should be turned over to them for exploitation. They insisted that the accessible part of Kaiochow Bay, the part where trade entered and left, should be delivered over to them for sovereign control for ninety-nine years, and that they should be given a concession for a railway into the interior and for the right to exploit mines in that rich mineral country for thirty miles on either side of the railway.

This was not unprecedented, my fellow countrymen. Other civilized nations had done the same thing to China, and at that time what did the Government of the United States do? I want to speak with the utmost respect for the administration of that time, and the respect is unaffected. That very lovable and honest gentleman, William McKinley, was President of the United States. His Secretary of State was one of the most honorable and able of the long series of our Secretaries of State, the Hon. John Hay. I believe Mr. Hay, if he had seen any way to accomplish more than he did accomplish, would have attempted to accomplish it, but this is all that the administration of Mr.

McKinley attempted: They did not even protest against this compulsory granting to Germany of the best part of a rich Province of a helpless country, but only stipulated that the Germans should keep it open to the trade of the United States. They did not make the least effort to save the rights of China; they only tried to save the commercial advantages of the United States. There immediately followed upon that cession to Germany a cession to Russia of Port Arthur and the region called Talien-Wan for twenty-five years, with a privilege of renewing it for a similar period. When, soon afterwards, Japan and Russia came to blows, you remember what happened. Russia was obliged to turn over to Japan Port Arthur and Talien-Wan, just exactly as Japan is now allowed to take over the German rights in Shantung. This Government, though the conference which determined these things was held on our own soil, did not, so far as I have been able to learn, make the slightest intimation of objecting. At the time Germany got Kiaochow Bay, England came in and said that since Germany was getting a piece of Shantung and Russia was getting Port Arthur and Talien-Wan, she would insist upon having her slice of China, too, and the region of Wei-hai-wei was ceded to her. Immediately upon that France got into the unhandsome game, and there was ceded to France for ninety-nine years one of the ports of China with the region lying behind it. In all of those transactions there was not a single attempt by the Government of the United States to do anything except to keep those regions open to our traders.

You now have the historic setting of the settlement about Shantung. What I want to call your attention to is that the treaty of peace does not take Shantung from China; it takes it from Germany. There are seventy-eight years of the ninety-nine still to run, and not only do we not take it from China, but Japan promises in an agreement which is formally recorded, which is acknowledged by the Japanese

Government, to return all the sovereign rights which Germany enjoyed in Shantung without qualification to China, and to retain nothing except what foreign corporations have throughout China, the right to run that railroad and exploit those mines. There is not a great commercial and industrial nation in Europe that does not enjoy privileges of that sort in China, and some of them enjoy them at the expense of the sovereignty of China. Japan has promised to release everything that savors of sovereignty and return it to China itself. She will have no right to put armed men anywhere into that portion of China. She will have no right to interfere with the civil administration of that portion of China. She will have no rights but economic and commercial rights. Now, if we choose to say that we will not assent to the Shantung provision, what do we do for China? Absolutely nothing. Japan has what Germany had in China in her military possession now. She has the promise of Great Britain and France that so far as they are concerned she can have it without qualification, and the only way we can take it away from Japan is by going to war with Japan and Great Britain and France.

The League of Nations for the first time provides a tribunal in which not only the sovereign rights of Germany and Japan in China, but the sovereign rights of other nations can be curtailed, because every member of the League solemnly covenants to respect and preserve the territorial integrity and existing political independence of the other members, and China is to be a member. Never before, my fellow citizens, has there been a tribunal to which people like China could carry the intolerable grievances to which they have been subjected. Now a great tribunal has been set up in which the pressure of the whole judgment of the world will be exercised in her behalf.

That is the significance of Article X. Article X is the heart of the whole promise of peace, because it cuts out of the transactions of nations all attempts to impair the

territorial integrity or invade the political independence of the weak as well as of the strong. Why did not Mr. Hay protest the acquisition of those rights in Shantung by Germany? Why did he not protest what England got, and what France got, and what Russia got? Because under international law, as it then stood, that would have been a hostile act toward those governments. The law of the world was actually such that if you mentioned anybody else's wrong but your own, you spoke as an enemy. After you have read Article X, read Article XI. Article XI says that is shall be the friendly right of any member of the League, strong or weak, to call the attention of the League to any matter, anywhere, that affects the peace of the world or the good understanding between nations upon which the peace of the world depends; so that for the first time it affords fine spirits like Mr. McKinley and Mr. John Hay the right to stand up before mankind and protest, and to say, "The rights of China shall be as sacred as the rights of those nations that are able to take care of themselves by arms." It is the most hopeful change in the law of the world that has ever been suggested or adopted.

But there is another subject upon which some of our fellow citizens are particularly sensitive. They say, "What does the League of Nations do for the right of self-determination?" I think I can answer that question; if not satisfactorily, at any rate very specifically. It was not within the privilege of the conference of peace to act upon the right of self-determination of any peoples except those which had been included in the territories of the defeated empires—that is to say, it was not then within their power —but the moment the covenant of the League of Nations is adopted it becomes their right. If the desire for self-determination of any people in the world is likely to affect the peace of the world or the good understanding between nations, it becomes the business of the League; it becomes the right of any member of the League to call attention to

it; it becomes the function of the League to bring the whole process of the opinion of the world to bear upon that very matter. Where before, and when before, may I ask some of my fellow countrymen who want a forum upon which to conduct a hopeful agitation, were they ever offered the opportunity to bring their case to the judgment of mankind? If they are not satisfied with that, their case is not good. The only case that you ought to bring with diffidence before the great jury of men throughout the world is the case that you can not establish. The only thing I shall ever be afraid to see the League of Nations discuss, if the United States is concerned, is a case which I can hardly imagine, where the United States is wrong, because I have the hopeful and confident expectation that whenever a case in which the United States is affected is brought to the consideration of that great body we need have no nervousness as to the elements of the argument so far as we are concerned. The glory of the United States is that it never claimed anything to which it was not justly entitled.

I look forward with a quickened pulse to the days that lie ahead of us as a member of the League of Nations, for we shall be a member of the League of Nations—I look forward with confidence and with exalted hope to the time when we can indeed legitimately and constantly be the champions and friends of those who are struggling for right anywhere in the world, and no nation is likely to forget, my fellow citizens, that behind the moral judgment of the United States resides the overwhelming force of the United States. We were respected in those old Revolutionary days when there were three millions of us. We are, it happens, very much more respected, now that there are more than a hundred millions of us. Now that we command some of the most important resources of the world, back of the majesty of the United States lies the strength of the United States. If Germany had ever dreamed, when she conceived her ungodly enterprise, that

the United States would have come into the war, she never would have dared to attempt it.

But now, my fellow citizens, the hope of Germany has revived. The hope of Germany has revived, because in the debates now taking place in the United States she sees a hope of at last doing what her arms could not do—dividing the United States from the great nations with which it was associated in the war. Here is a quotation from a recent utterance of one of her counsellors of state:

"All humanity, Germany particularly, is tensely awaiting the decision of the American Senate on the peace treaty," ex-Minister of State von Scheller-Steinwartz said to-day. "Apparently"—out of respect for him I will not mention the name that that ex-Minister Steinwartz mentions—"apparently Senator Blank is the soul of the opposition. The Senator is no German hater. He hates all non-Americans equally, and he is absolutely a just man of almost Quaker-like moral strength." How delightful to receive such praise from such a source! "When he and other important Senators fight the peace treaty, their course means that the treaty displeases them because in the excessive enslavement of Germany, for which America would be forever responsible, they see grave danger of future complications. That course is thus to be hailed like the morning red of a new dawn." A new dawn of the world? Oh, no; a new dawn for Germany. "There is promise of a still better realization of conditions in the prospect that America, in all seriousness, may express the wish for a separate peace with the Central Powers."

A separate peace with the Central Powers could accomplish nothing but our eternal disgrace, and I would like, if my voice could reach him, to let this German counsellor know that the red he sees upon the horizon is not the red of a new dawn, but the red of a consuming fire which will consume everything like the recent purposes of the Central Empires. It is not without significance, my fellow citizens,

that coincidentally with this debate with regard to the ratification of this treaty the whole pro-German propaganda has shown its head all over the United States. I would not have you understand me to mean that the men who are opposing the ratification of the treaty are consciously encouraging the pro-German propaganda. I have no right to say that or to think it, but I do say that what they are doing is encouraging the pro-German propaganda, and that it is bringing about a hope in the minds of those whom we have just spent our precious blood to defeat that they may separate us from the rest of the world and produce this interesting spectacle, only two nations standing aside from the great concert and guaranty of peace—beaten Germany and triumphant America.

See what can be accomplished by that. By that the attitude of the rest of the world toward America will be exactly what its recent attitude was toward Germany, and we will be in the position absolutely alien to every American conception of playing a lone hand in the world for our selfish advantage and aggrandizement. The thing is inconceivable. The thing is intolerable. The thing can and will never happen.

I speak of these things in order that you may realize, my fellow citizens, the solemnity and the significance of this debate in which we are engaged; its solemnity because it involves the honor of the United States and the peace of humanity, its significance because whether gentlemen plan it or not, not only refusal on our part, but long hesitation on our part to cast our fortunes permanently in with the fortunes of those who love right and liberty will be to bring mankind again into the shadow of that valley of death from which we have just emerged.

Address at Luncheon, Palace Hotel, San Francisco, Calif.

September 18, 1919

Mr. Toastmaster, My Fellow Countrymen:

I stood here yesterday, but before a very different audience, an audience that it was very delightful to address, and it is no less delightful to find myself face to face with this thoughtful group of citizens of one of the most progressive states in the Union. Because, after all, my fellow citizens, our thought must be of the present and the future. The men who do not look forward now are of no further service to the nation. The immediate need of this country and of the world is peace not only, but settled peace, peace upon a definite and well-understood foundation, supported by such covenants as men can depend upon, supported by such purposes as will permit of a concert of action throughout all the free peoples of the world. The very interesting remarks of your toastmaster have afforded me the opportunity to pay the tribute which they earn to the gentlemen with whom I was associated on the other side of the water. I do not believe that we often enough stop to consider how remarkable the peace conference in Paris has been. It is the first great international conference which did not meet to consider the interests and advantages of the strong nations. It is the first international conference that did not convene in order to make the arrangements which would establish the control of the strong. I want to testify that the whole spirit of the conference was the spirit of men who do not regard themselves as the masters of anybody, but as the servants of the people whom they represent. I found them quick with sympathy from the peoples who had been through all these dolorous ages imposed upon, upon whom the whole yoke of civilization seemed to have been fastened so that it never could be taken off again.

The heart of this treaty, my fellow citizens, is that it gives liberty and independence to people who never could have got it for themselves, because the men who constituted that conference realized that the basis of war was the imposition of the will of strong nations upon those who could not resist them. You have only to take the formula of the recent war in order to see what was the matter. The formula of Pan-Germanism was Bremen to Bagdad. What is the line from Bremen to Bagdad? It leads through partitioned Poland, through prostrated Roumania, through subjugated Slavia, down through disordered Turkey, and on into distressed Persia, and every foot of the line is a line of political weakness. Germany was looking for the line of least resistance to establish her power, and unless the world makes that a line of absolute resistance this war will have to be fought over again. You must settle the difficulties which gave occasion to the war or you must expect war again. You know what had happened all through that territory. Almost everywhere there were German princes planted on thrones where they did not belong, where they were alien, where they were of a different tradition and a different people, mere agents of a political plan, the seething center of which was that unhappy city of Constantinople, where, I dare say, there was more intrigue to the square inch than there has ever been anywhere else in the world, and where not the most honest minds always but generally the most adroit minds were sent to play upon the cupidity of the Turkish authorities and upon the helplessness of the Balkan States, in order to make a field for European aggression. I am not now saying that Germany was the only intriguer. I am not now saying that hers was the only plans of advantage, but I am saying that there was the field where lay the danger of the world in regard to peace. Every statesman in Europe knew it, and at last it dawned upon them that the remedy was not balances of power but liberty and right.

An illumination of profound understanding of human affairs shines upon the deliberations of that conference that never shone upon the deliberations of any other international conference in history, and therefore it is a happy circumstance to me to be afforded the opportunity to say how delightful it was to find that these gentlemen had not accepted the American specifications for the peace—for you remember they were the American specifications—because America had come in and assisted them and because America was powerful and they desired her influence and assistance, but because they already believed in them. When we uttered our principles, the principles for which we were fighting, they had only to examine the thoughts of their own people to find that those were also the principles for which their people were fighting as well as the people of the United States; and the delightful enthusiasm which showed itself in accomplishing some of the most disinterested tasks of the peace was a notable circumstance of the whole conference. I was glad after I inaugurated it that I drew together the little body which was called the big four. We did not call it the big four; we called it something very much bigger than that. We called it the supreme council of the principal allied and associated powers. We had to have some name, and the more dramatic it was the better; but it was a very simple council of friends. The intimacies of that little room were the center of the whole peace conference, and they were the intimacies of men who believed in the same things and sought the same objects. The hearts of men like Clemenceau and Lloyd-George and Orlando beat with the people of the world as well as with the people of their own countries. They have the same fundamental sympathies that we have, and they know that there is only one way to work out peace and that is to work out right.

The peace of the world is absolutely indispensable to us, and immediately indispensable to us. There is not a

single domestic problem that can be worked out in the right temper or opportunity and in time unless we have conditions that we can count on. I do not need to tell business men that they can not conduct their business if they do not know what is going to happen tomorrow. You can not make plans unless you have certain elements in the future upon which you can depend. You can not seek markets unless you know whether you are going to seek them among people who suspect you or people who believe in you. If the United States is going to stand off and play truant in this great enterprise of justice and right then you must expect to be looked upon with suspicion and hostile rivalry everywhere in the world. They will say, "These men are not intending to assist; they are intending to exploit us." You know what happened just a few months before we went into the war. There was a conference at Paris consisting of representatives of the principal allied powers for the purpose of concerting a sort of economic league in which they would manage their purchasing as well as their selling in a way which would redound to their advantage and make use of the rest of the world. That was because they then thought what they will be obliged to think again if we do not continue our partnership with them—that we were standing off to get what we could out of it, and they were making a defensive economic arrangement. Very well; they will do that again. Almost of instinct they will do it again, not out of a deliberate hostility to the United States but by the general instinctive impulse of their own business interest and their own business men. Therefore we can not arrange a single element of our business until we have settled peace and know whether we are going to deal with a friendly world or an unfriendly world.

We can not determine our own internal economic reforms until then, and there must be some very fundamental economic reforms in this country. There must be a re-

consideration of the structure of our economic society. Whether we will or no, the majority of mankind demand it, in America as well as elsewhere, and we have got to sit down in the best temper possible, in times of quiet, in times permitting conciliation and not hostility, and determine what we are going to do. We can not do it until we have peace. We can not release the great industrial and economic power of America and let it run free until there are channels that are free in which it can run. And the channels of business are mental channels as well as physical channels. In an open market men's minds must be open. It has been said so often that it is a very trite saying, but it remains nevertheless true, that a financial panic is a mere state of mind. There are no fewer resources in a country at the time of a panic than there were the day before it broke. There is no less money, there is no less energy, there is no less individual capacity and initiative, but something has frightened everybody and credits are drawn in and everybody builds a fence around himself and is careful to keep behind the fence and wait and see what is going to happen. That is a panic. It is a waiting, a fearful expecting of something to happen. Generally it does not happen. Generally men slowly get their breath again and say, "Well, the world looks just the same as it did; we had better get to work again." Even when business is absolutely prostrate they are at least in the condition that a friend of mine described. He was asked at the time of one of our greatest panics, some twenty-five years ago, if business was not looking up. He said, "Yes, it is so flat on its back that it can not look any other way." Even if it is flat on its back, it can see the world; it is not lying on its face and it will presently sit up and begin to take a little nourishment and take notice, and the panic is over. But while the whole world is in doubt what to expect, the whole world is under the partial paralysis that is characteristic of a panic. You do not know what it is

safe to do with your money now. You do not know what plans it is safe to make for your business now. You have got to know what the world of to-morrow is going to be, and you will not know until we have settled the great matter of peace.

I want to remind you how the permanency of peace is at the heart of this treaty. This is not merely a treaty of peace with Germany. It is a world settlement; not affecting those parts of the world, of course, which were not involved in the war, because the conference had no jurisdiction over them, but the war did extend to most parts of the world, and the scattered, dismembered assets of the Central Empires and of Turkey gave us plenty to do and covered the greater part of the distressed populations of the world. It is nothing less than a world settlement, and at the center of that stands this covenant for the future which we call the covenant of the League of Nations. Without it the treaty can not be worked, and without it it is a mere temporary arrangement with Germany. The covenant of the League of Nations is the instrumentality for the maintenance of peace.

How does it propose to maintain it? By the means that all forward-looking and thoughtful men have desired for generations together, by substituting arbitration and discussion for war. To hear some gentlemen talk you would think that the council of the League of Nations is to spend its time considering when to advise other people to fight. That is what comes of a constant concentration of attention upon Article X. Article X ought to have been somewhere further down in the covenant, because it is in the background; it is not in the foreground. I am going to take the liberty of expounding this to you, though I assume that you have all read the covenant. At the heart of that covenant are these tremendous arrangements: Every member of the League solemnly agrees—and let me pause to say that that means every fighting nation in the world,

because for the present, limited to an army of 100,000, Germany is not a fighting nation—that it will never go to war without first having done one or another of two things, without either submitting the matter in dispute to arbitration, in which case it promises absolutely to abide by the verdict, or, if it does not care to submit it to arbitration, without submitting it to discussion by the council of the League of Nations, in which case it promises to lay all the documents and all the pertinent facts before that council; it consents that that council shall publish all the documents and all the pertinent facts, so that all the world shall know them; that it shall be allowed six months in which to consider the matter; and that even at the end of the six months, if the decision of the council is not acceptable, it will still not go to war for three months following the rendering of the decision. So that, even allowing no time for the preliminaries, there are nine months of cooling off, nine months of discussion, nine months not of private discussion, not of discussion between those who are heated, but of discussion between those who are disinterested except in the maintenance of the peace of the world, when the purifying and rectifying influence of the public opinion of mankind is brought to bear upon the contest.

If anything approaching that had been the arrangement of the world in 1914, the war would have been impossible; and I confidently predict that there is not an aggressive people in the world who would dare bring a wrongful purpose to that jury. It is the most formidable jury in the world. Personally, I have never, so far as I know, been in danger of going to jail, but I would a great deal rather go to jail than do wrong and be punished merely by the look in the eyes of the men amongst whom I circulated. I would rather go to jail than be sent to Coventry. I would rather go to jail than be conscious every day that I was despised and distrusted. After all, the only overwhelming force in the world is the force of opinion.

If any member of the League ignores these promises with regard to arbitration and discussion, what happens? War? No; not war, but something more tremendous, I take leave to say, than war. An absolute isolation, a boycott. It is provided in the covenant that any nation that disregards these solemn promises with regard to arbitration and discussion shall be thereby deemed ipso facto to have committed an act of war against the other members of the League, and that there shall thereupon follow an absolute exclusion of that nation from communication of any kind with the members of the League. No goods can be shipped in or out; no telegraphic messages can be exchanged, except through the elusive wireless perhaps; there shall be no communication of any kind between the people of the other nations and the people of that nation. There is not a nation in Europe that can stand that for six months. Germany could have faced the armies of the world more readily than she faced the boycott of the world. Germany felt the pinch of the blockade more than she felt the stress of the blow; and there is not, so far as I know, a single European country—I say European because I think our own country is an exception—which is not dependent upon some other part of the world for some of the necessaries of its life. Some of them are absolutely dependent, some of them are without raw materials practically of any kind, some of them are absolutely without fuel of any kind, either coal or oil; almost all of them are without that variety of supply of ores which are necessary to modern industry and necessary to the manufacture of munitions of war. When you apply that boycott, you have got your hand upon the throat of the offending nation, and it is a proper punishment. It is an exclusion from civilized society.

Inasmuch as I have sometimes been said to have been very disregardful of the constitutional rights of Congress, may I not stop to speak just for a moment of a small mat-

ter that I was punctilious to attend to in regard to that Article? You will notice the language that any member of the League that makes breach of its covenants shall be regarded thereby "ipso facto to have committed an act of war." In the original draft it read, "Shall thereby be ipso facto regarded as at war with the other nations of the world." I said, "No; I can not subscribe to that, because I am bound to safeguard the right of Congress to determine whether it is at war or not. I consent to its being an act of war by the party committing it, but whether Congress takes up the gage thus thrown down or not is another matter which I can not participate in determining in a document of this sort." Germany committed several acts of war against us before we accepted the inevitable and took up her challenge, and it was only because of a sort of accumulation of evidence that Germany's design was not merely to sink American ships and injure American citizens, that was incidental to her design, but that her design was to destroy free political society. I remember saying to Congress before we went into the war that if Germany committed some act of war against us that was intolerable, I might have to give them different advice, and I remember a newspaper correspondent asked me what I thought would constitute such an act. I said, "I don't know, but I am perfectly certain I will know it when I see it. I can not hypothetically define it, but it will be perfectly obvious when it occurs." And if Congress regards this act by some other member of the League as such an act of war against it as necessitates the maintenance of the honor of the United States, then it may in those circumstances declare war, but it is not bound to declare war under the engagement of the covenant. What I am emphasizing, my fellow citizens, is this: That the heart of this covenant is arbitration and discussion, and that is the only possible basis for peace in the future.

It is a basis for something better than peace. Civiliza-

tion proceeds on the principle of understanding one another. You know peace between those who employ labour and those who labour depends upon conference and mutual understanding. If you do not get together with the other side, it will be hostility to the end; and after you have heard the case of the other fellow it sometimes becomes a little awkward for you to insist upon the whole of your case, because the human mind does have this fine quality—that it finds it embarrassing to face the truth and deny it. Moreover, the basis of friendship is intercourse. I know —I am very fond of—a very large number of men whom I know to be crooks. They are very engaging fellows, and when I form a judgment against them I have to be in another room. I can not, because of my personal attitude toward them, form a harsh judgment; indeed, I suppose the very thing that gives some men the chance to be crooks is their fascinating personality. They put it over on you.

Until we went into this war, my fellow citizens, it was the almost universal impression of the world that our idealism was a mere matter of words; that what we were interested in was getting on in the world and making as much as we could out of it. That was the sum and substance of the usual opinion of us outside of America; and in the short space that we were in this war that opinion was absolutely reversed.

Consider what they saw: The flower of our youth sent three and four thousand miles away from their home, a home which could not be directly touched by the flames of that war, sent to foreign fields to mix with foreign and alien armies to fight for a cause which they recognized as the common cause of mankind, and not the peculiar cause of America. It caused a revulsion of feeling, a revulsion of attitude which, I dare say, has never been paralleled in the world; and at this moment, unless the cynical counsels of some of our acquaintances should prevail—which God forbid—they are expecting and inviting us to lead the civil-

ized world, because they trust us—they really and truly trust us. They would not believe, no matter where we sent an army to be of assistance to them, that we would ever use that army for any purpose but to assist them. They know that when we say, as we said when we sent men to Siberia, that we are sending them to assist in the distribution of food and clothing and shoes so that brigands will not seize them, and that for the rest we are ready to render any assistance which they want us to render, and will interfere in absolutely nothing that concerns their own affairs, we mean it, and they believe us. There is not a place in this world now, unless we wait a little while longer, where America's political ambitions are looked upon with suspicion. That was frankly admitted in this little conference that I have spoken of. Not one of those gentlemen thought that America had any ulterior designs whatever. They were, therefore, in all our conferences, in consulting our economical experts, in consulting our geographical experts, constantly turning to America to act as umpire; and in nine cases out of ten, just because America was disinterested and could look at the thing without any other purpose than reaching a practicable solution, it was the American solution that was accepted.

In order that we may not forget, I brought with me the figures as to what this war meant to the world. This is a body of business men, and you will understand these figures. They are too big for the imagination of men who do not handle big things. Here is the cost of the war in money, exclusive of what we loaned one another: Great Britain and her dominions, $38,000,000,000; France, $26,000,000,000; the United States, $22,000,000,000 (this is the direct cost of our operations); Russia, $18,000,000,000; Italy, $13,000,000,000; and the total, including Belgium, Japan, and other countries, $123,000,000,000. This is what it cost the Central Powers: Germany, $39,000,000,000, the biggest single item; Austro-Hungary, $21,-

000,000,000; Turkey and Bulgaria, $3,000,000,000; a total of $63,000,000,000, and a grand total of direct war costs of $186,000,000,000—almost the capital of the world. The expenditures of the United States were at the rate of $1,000,000 an hour for two years, including night-time and day-time. The battle deaths during the war were as follows: Russia lost in dead 1,700,000 men, poor Russia that got nothing but terror and despair out of it all; Germany, 1,600,000; France, 1,385,000; Great Britain, 900,000; Austria, 800,000; Italy, 364,000; the United States, 50,300 dead. The total for all the belligerents, 7,450,200 men—just about seven and a half million killed because we could not have arbitration and discussion, because the world had never had the courage to propose the conciliatory methods which some of us are now doubting whether we ought to accept or not. The totals for wounded are not obtainable except our own. Our own wounded were 230,000, excluding those who were killed. The total of all battle deaths in all the wars of the world from the year 1793 to 1914 was something under 6,000,000 men, so that about a million and a half more men were killed in this war than in all the wars of something more than one hundred preceding years. We really can not realize that. Those of us who lost sons or brothers can realize it. We know what it meant. The women who have little children crowding about their knees know what it means; they know that the world has hitherto been devoted to brutal methods of settlement, and that every time a war occurs it is the flower of the manhood that is destroyed; that it is not so much the present generation as the next generation that goes maimed off the stage or is laid away in obscure graves upon some battle field; and that great nations are impaired in their vitality for two generations together and all their life embittered by a method of settlement for which we could find, and have now found, a substitute.

My fellow citizens, I believe in Divine Providence. If

I did not, I would go crazy. If I thought the direction of the disordered affairs of this world depended upon our finite intelligence, I should not know how to reason my way to sanity, and I do not believe that there is any body of men, however they concert their power or their influence, that can defeat this great enterprise, which is the enterprise of divine mercy and peace and good will.

ADDRESS AT AUDITORIUM, OAKLAND, CALIF.

SEPTEMBER 18, 1919

Dr. Rinehart, My Fellow Citizens:

I am not going to speak tonight particularly of the covenant of the League of Nations. I am going to point out to you what the treaty as a whole is. In the first place, of course, that treaty imposes upon Germany the proper penalty for the crime she attempted to commit. It is a just treaty in spite of its severity. It is a treaty made by men who had no intention of crushing the German people, but who did mean to have it burnt into the consciousness of the German people, and through their consciousness into the apprehension of the world, that no people could afford to live under a Government which was not controlled by their purpose and will and which was at liberty to impose secret ambitions upon the civilization of the world. It was intended as notice to all mankind that any Government that attempted what Germany attempted would meet with the same concerted opposition of mankind and would have meted out to it the same just retribution. All that this treaty amounts to, so far as Germany is concerned, is that she shall be obliged to pay every dollar that she can afford to pay to repair the damage that she did; except for the territorial arrangements which it includes, that is practically the whole of the treaty so far as it concerns Ger-

many. What has not been borne in upon the consciousness of some of our people is that, although most of the words of the treaty are devoted to the settlement with Germany, the greater part of the meaning of its provisions is devoted to the settlement of the world.

The treaty begins with the covenant of the League of Nations, which is intended to operate as a partnership, a permanent partnership, of the great and free self-governing peoples of the world to stand sponsor for the right and for civilization. Notice is given in the very first articles of the treaty that hereafter it will not be a matter of conjecture whether the other great nations of the world will combine against a wrongdoer, but a matter of certainty that hereafter nations contemplating what the Government of Germany contemplated will not have to conjecture whether Great Britain and France and Italy and the great United States will join hands against them, but will know that mankind, in serried ranks, will defend to the last the rights of human beings wherever they are. This is the first treaty ever framed by such an international convention, whose object was not to serve and defend governments but to serve and defend peoples. This is the first people's treaty in the history of international dealings. Every member of that great convention of peace was poignantly aware that at last the people of the world were awake, that at last the people of the world were aware of what wrong had been wrought by irresponsible and autocratic governments, that at last all the peoples of the world had seen the vision of liberty, had seen the majesty of justice, had seen the doors thrown open to the aspirations of men and women and the fortunes of children everywhere, and they did not dare assume that they were the masters of the fortunes of any people, but knew that in every settlement they must act as the servants not only of their own people but of the people who were waiting to be liberated, the people who could not win their own liberty, the people who had suf-

fered for centuries together the intolerable wrongs of misgovernment. This is a treaty not merely for the peoples who were represented at the peace table but for the people who were the subjects of the governments whose wrongs were forever ended by the victory on the fields of France.

My fellow citizens, you know and you hear it said every day, you read it in the newspapers, you hear it in the conversation of your friends, that there is unrest all over the world. You hear that in every part of the world, not excluding our own beloved country, there are men who feel that society has been shaken to its foundations, and that it ought to have been shaken to its foundations, in order that men might be awakened to the wrongs that had been done and were continuing to be done. When you look into the history, not of our own free and fortunate continent, happily, but of the rest of the world, you will find that the hand of pitiless power has been upon the shoulders of the great mass of mankind since time began, and that only with that glimmer of light which came at Calvary, that first dawn which came with the Christian era, did men begin to wake to the dignity and right of the human soul, and that in spite of professions of Christianity, in spite of purposes of reform, in spite of theories of right and of justice, the great body of our fellow beings have been kept under the will of men who exploited them and did not give them the full right to live and realize the purposes that God had meant them to realize. There is little for the great part of the history of the world except the bitter tears of pity and the hot tears of wrath, and when you look, as we were permitted to look in Paris, into some of the particular wrongs which the peoples of Central Europe, the peoples upon whom the first foundations of the new German power were to be built, had suffered for generations together, you wonder why they lay so long quiet, you wonder why men, statesmen, men who pretended to have an outlook upon the world, waited so long to deliver them.

The characteristic of this treaty is that it gives liberty to peoples who never could have won it for themselves. By giving that liberty, it limits the ambitions and defeats the hopes of all the imperialistic governments in the world. Governments which had theretofore been considered to desire dominion, here in this document forswore dominion, renounced it, said, "The fundamental principle upon which we are going to act is this, that every great territory of the world belongs to the people who live in it and that it is their right and not our right to determine the sovereignty they shall live under and the form of government they shall maintain." It is astonishing that this great document did not come as a shock upon the world. If the world had not already been rent by the great struggle which preceded this settlement, men would have stood at amaze at such a document as this; but there is a subtle consciousness throughout the world now that this is an end of governing people who do not desire the government that is over them.

And, going further than that, the makers of the treaty proceeded to arrange, upon a cooperative basis, those things which had always been arranged before upon a competitive basis. I want to mention a very practical thing, which most of you, I dare say, never thought about. Most of the rivers of Europe traverse the territory of several nations, and up to the time of this peace conference there had been certain historic rights and certain treaty rights over certain parts of the courses of those rivers which had embarrassed the people who lived higher up upon the streams; just as if the great Mississippi, for example, passed through half a dozen states and the people down at New Orleans lived under a government which could control the navigation of the lower part of the Mississippi and so hamper the commerce of the states above them to the north which wished to pass to the sea by the courses of the Mississippi. There were abundant instances of that sort in Europe, and this

treaty undertakes to internationalize all the great waterways of that continent, to see to it that their several porions are taken out of national control and put under international control, so that the stream that passes through one nation shall be just as free in all its length to the sea as if that nation owned the whole of it, and nobody shall have the right to put a restriction upon their passage to the sea. I mention this in order to illustrate the heart of this treaty, which is to cut out national privilege and give to every people the full right attaching to the territory in which they live.

Then the treaty did something more than that. You have heard of the covenant of the League of Nations until, I dare say, you suppose that is the only thing in the treaty. On the contrary, there is a document almost as extensive in the latter part of the treaty which is nothing less than a great charter of liberty for the working men and women of the world. One of the most striking and useful provisions of the treaty is that every member of the League of Nations undertakes to advance the humane conditions of labour for men, women, and children, to consider the interests of labour under its own jurisdiction, and to try to extend to every nation with which it has any dealings the standards of labour upon which it itself insists; so that America, which has by no means yet reached the standards in those matters which we must and shall reach, but which, nevertheless, is the most advanced in the world in respect of the conditions of labour, undertakes to bring all the influence it can legitimately bear upon every nation with which it has any dealings to see that labour there is put upon as good a footing as labour in America. Perhaps some of you have not kept in mind the Seamen's Act which was passed in a recent session of Congress. Under the law before that act, seamen could be bound to the service of their ship in such fashion that when they came to the ports of the United States, if they tried to leave their ship,

the Government of the United States was bound to arrest them and send them back to their ship. The Seamen's Act abrogates that law and practically makes it necessary for every ship that would take away from the United States the crew that it brings to it shall pay American wages to get it. Before this treaty was entered into the United States had entered upon the business of trying to extend to labouring men elsewhere the advantages which labouring men in the United States enjoy, and supplementing that promise in the covenant of the League there is an elaborate arrangement for a periodic international conference in the interest of labour. It provides that that conference shall be called next month in the city of Washington by the President of the United States, and the President of the United States has already called it. We are awaiting to learn from the Senate of the United States whether we can attend it or not. We can at least sit and listen and wonder how long we are going to be kept out of membership of this great humane endeavor to see that working men and women and children everywhere in the world are regarded as human beings and taken care of as they ought to be taken care of.

This treaty does not stop there. It attempts to coordinate all the great humane endeavors of the world. It tries to bring under international cooperation every effort to check international crime. I mean like that unspeakable traffic in women, like that almost equally unspeakable traffic in children. It undertakes to control the dealing in deadly drugs like opium. It organizes a new method of cooperation among all the great Red Cross societies of the world. I tell you, my fellow citizens, that simple red cross has come to mean to the world more than it ever meant before. Everywhere—in the remotest recesses of the world—there are people who wear that symbol, and every time I look at it I feel like taking off my hat, as if I had seen a symbol of the world's heart. This treaty is nothing less

than an organization of liberty and mercy for the world. I wish you would get a copy of it and read it. A good deal of it is technical and you could skip that part, but read all of it that you do not need an expert to advise you with regard to the meaning of. The economic and financial clauses which particularly affect the settlements with Germany are, I dare say, almost unintelligible to most people, but you do not have to understand them; they are going to be worked out by experts. The rest of it is going to be worked out by the experience of free self-governed peoples.

One of the interesting provisions of the covenant of the League of Nations is that no nation can be a member of that League which is not a self-governing nation. No autocratic government can come into its membership; no government which is not controlled by the will and vote of its people. It is a League of free, independent peoples, all over the world, and when that great arrangement is consummated there is not going to be a ruler in the world that does not take his advice from his people. Germany is for the present excluded, but she is excluded only in order that she may undergo a period of probation, during which she shall prove two things—first, that she has really changed her constitution permanently, and, second, that she intends to administer that constitution in the spirit of its terms. You read in the newspapers that there are intrigues going on in Germany for the restoration of something like the old government, perhaps for the restoration of the throne and placing upon it some member of the family of Hohenzollern. Very well, if that should be accomplished Germany is forever excluded from the League of Nations. It is not our business to say to the German people what sort of government they shall have; it is our fundamental principle that that is their business and not ours, but it is our business to say whom we will keep company with, and if Germany wishes to live in respectable society she will never have another Hohenzollern. The other day, you

will notice, Hungary for a little while put one of the Austrian princes upon her throne, and the peace conference, still sitting in Paris, sent word that they could not deal with a government which had one of the Hapsburgs at its head. The Hapsburgs and the Hohenzollerns are permanently out of business.

You notice that one of the grounds of anxiety of a small group of our fellow citizens is whether they can get out of the League if they ever get in, and so they want to have the key put in their pockets; they want to be assigned a seat right by the door; they want to sit on the edge of their chairs and say, "If anything happens in this meeting to which I am in the least sensitive, I leave." That, my fellow citizens, is not the spirit of America. What is going to happen is this: We are not going to sit by the door; we are going to sit in the high seats, and if the present attitude of the peoples of the world toward America is any index of what it will continue to be, the counsels of the United States will be the prevailing counsels of the League. If we were humbly at the outset to sit by the door, we would be invited to go up and take the chair. I, for one, do not want to be put in the attitude of children who, when the game goes against them, will not play, because I have such an unbounded confidence in the rectitude of the purpose of the United States that I am not afraid she will ever be caught proposing something which the other nations will defeat. She did not propose anything in Paris which the other nations defeated. The only obstacles, the only insuperable obstacles, met there were obstacles which were contained in treaties of which she had no notice, in secret treaties which certain great nations were bound in honor to respect, and the covenant of the League of Nations abolishes secret treaties. From this time forth all the world is going to know what all the agreements between nations are. It is going to know, not their general character merely, but their exact language and contents, be-

cause the provision of the League is that no treaty shall be valid which is not registered with the general secretary of the League, and the general secretary of the League is instructed to publish it in all its details at the earliest possible moment. Just as you can go to the courthouse and see all the mortgages on all the real estate in your county, you can go to the general secretariat of the League of Nations and find all the mortgages on all the nations. This treaty, in short, is a great clearance house. It is very little short of a canceling of the past and an insurance of the future.

Men have asked me, "Do you think that the League of Nations is an absolute guaranty against war?" Of course it is not; no human arrangement can give you an absolute guaranty against human passion, but I answer that question with another, "If you thought you had 50 per cent insurance against war, would not you jump at it? If you thought you had 30 per cent insurance against war, would not you take it? If you thought you had 10 per cent insurance against war, would not you think it better than nothing?" Whereas, in my judgment, this is 99 per cent insurance, because the one thing that a wrong cause can not stand is exposure. If you think that you have a friend who is a fool, encourage him to hire a hall. The particular thing that this treaty provides in the covenant of the League of Nations is that every cause shall be deliberately exposed to the judgment of mankind. It substitutes what the whole world has long been for, namely, arbitration and discussion for war. In other words, all the great fighting nations of the world—for Germany for the time being, at any rate, is not a great fighting nation—promise to lay their case, whatever it may be, before the whole jury of humanity. If there had been any arrangement comparable with this in 1914, the calamitous war which we have just passed through would have been inconceivable.

Address at Stadium, San Diego, Calif.
September 19, 1919

Mr. Mayor, My Fellow Countrymen:

As you know, I have come from Washington on a very serious errand, indeed, and I need not tell you with what a thrill the sight of this great body of my fellow citizens fills my heart, because I believe that one of the most important verdicts of history has now to be rendered by the great people of the United States. I believe that this is a choice from which we can not turn back. Whether it be the choice of honor or of dishonor, it will be a final choice that we shall make in this great hour of our history.

One of the most unexpected things that I have found on my journey is that the people of the United States have not been informed as to the real character and scope and contents of the great treaty of peace with Germany. Whether by omission or by intention, they have been directed in all of the speeches that I have read to certain points of the treaty which are incidental, and not central, and their attention has been drawn away from the real meaning of this great human document. For that, my fellow citizens, is just what it is. It not only concludes a peace with Germany and imposes upon Germany the proper penalties for the outrage she attempted upon mankind, but it also concludes the peace in the spirit in which the war was undertaken by the nations opposed to Germany. The challenge of war was accepted by them not with the purpose of crushing the German people but with the purpose of putting an end once and for all to such plots against the free governments of the world as had been conceived on Wilhelmstrasse, in Berlin, unknown to the people of Germany, unconceived by them, advised by little groups of men who had the military power to carry out private ambitions.

We went into this war not only to see that autocratic

power of that sort never threatened the world again but we went into it for even larger purposes than that. Other autocratic powers may spring up, but there is only one soil in which they can spring up, and that is the wrongs done to free peoples of the world. The heart and center of this treaty is that it sets at liberty people all over Europe and in Asia who had hitherto been enslaved by powers which were not their rightful sovereigns and masters. So long as wrongs like that exist in the world, you can not bring permanent peace to the world. I go further than that. So long as wrongs of that sort exist, you ought not to bring permanent peace to the world, because those wrongs ought to be righted, and enslaved peoples ought to be free to right them. For my part, I will not take any part in composing difficulties that ought not to be composed, and a difficulty between an enslaved people and its autocratic rulers ought not to be composed. We in America have stood from the day of our birth for the emancipation of people throughout the world who were living unwillingly under governments which were not of their own choice. The thing which we have held more sacred than any other is that all just government rests upon the consent of the governed, and all over the world that principle has been disregarded, that principle has been flouted by the strong, and only the weak have suffered. The heart and center of this treaty is the principle adopted not only in this treaty but put into effect also in the treaty with Austria, in the treaty with Hungary, in the treaty with Bulgaria, in the treaty with Turkey, that every great territory in the world belongs to the people who are living on it, and that it is not the privilege of any authority anywhere—certainly not the privilege of the peace conference at Paris—to impose upon those peoples any government which they accept unwillingly and not of their own choice.

Nations that never before saw the gleam of hope have

been liberated by this great document. Pitiful Poland, divided up as spoils among half a dozen nations, is by this document united and set free. Similarly, in the treaty with Austria, the Austrian power is taken off of every people over whom it had no right to reign. You know that the great populations of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which lay between Austria and the Balkan Peninsula, were unjustly under the power of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and it was in a city of Bosnia that the Crown Prince of Austria was assassinated—Bosnia which was under the power of Austria. Though Bosnia was part of Austrian territory, Austria had the audacity to hold Serbia, an outside neighbor, responsible for an act of assassination on Austrian territory, the Austrian Government choosing to believe that certain societies with which it connected the assassin, societies active in Serbia, had planned and executed the assassination. So the world was deluged in blood, and 7,400,000 men lie dead—not to speak of the pitiful wounded, not to speak of the blinded, not to speak of those with distracted brain, not to speak of all the pitiful, shattered nerves of millions of men all over the world—because of an insurgent feeling in a great population which was ruled over by rulers not of their own choice. The peace conference at Paris knew that it would not go to the root of this matter unless it destroyed power of that kind. This treaty sets those great peoples free.

But it does not stop with that. In the heart of the treaty you will find a new charter for those who labour—men, women, and children all over the world. The heart of the world is depressed, my fellow citizens, the heart of the world is uneasy. The heart of the world is a little despairful of its future, because the economic arrangements of the world have not been just, and the people who are having unjust conditions imposed upon them are, of course, not content to live under them. When the whole world is at unrest you may be sure that there is some real cause

for the unrest. It is not whimsical. Men do not disturb the foundations of their lives just to satisfy a sudden impulse. All these troubles, whatever shape they may take, whether the action taken is just or unjust, have their root in age-long wrongs which ought to be, must be, and will be righted, and this great treaty makes a beginning in that great enterprise of humanity. It provides an arrangement for recurrent and periodic international conferences, the main and sole object of which will be to improve the conditions of labour, to safeguard the lives and the health of women and children who work and whose lives would otherwise be impaired or whose health rendered subject to all the inroads of disease. The heart of humanity beats in this document. It is not a statesman's arrangement. It is a liberation of the peoples and of the humane forces of the world, and yet I never hear the slightest intimation of any of these great features in the speeches of the gentlemen who are opposing this treaty. They never tell you what is really in this treaty. If they did your enthusiasm would sweep them off their feet. If they did they would know that it was an audacity which they had better not risk to impair the peace and the humane conditions of mankind.

At the very front and heart of the treaty is the part which is most criticized, namely, the great covenant for a League of Nations. This treaty could not be executed without such a powerful instrumentality. Unless all the right-thinking nations of the world are going to concert their purpose and their power, this treaty is not worth the paper that it is written on, because it is a treaty where peace rests upon the right of the weak, and only the power of the strong can maintain the right of the weak. If we as a nation indeed mean what we have always said, that we are the champions of human right, now is the time when we shall be brought to the test, the acid test, as to whether we mean what we said or not. I am not saying that be-

cause I have the least doubt as to the verdict. I am just as sure of it as if it had been rendered already. I know this great people among whom I was born and bred and whom I have had the signal honor to serve, whose mouthpiece it has been my privilege to be on both sides of the water, and I know that I am speaking their conscience, when I speak in the name of my own conscience that that is the duty of America and that it will be assumed and performed.

You have been led to believe that the covenant of the League of Nations is in some sense a private invention. It is not always said of whom, and I need not mention who is suspected. It is supposed that out of some sort of personal ambition or party intention an authorship, an origination is sought. My fellow countrymen, I wish that I could claim the great distinction of having invented this great idea, but it is a great idea which has been growing in the minds of all generous men for several generations. Several generations? Why, it has been the dream of the friends of humanity through all the ages, and now for the first time a great body of practical statesmen, immersed in the business of individual nations, gets together and realizes the dream of honest men. I wish that I could claim some originative part in so great an enterprise, but I can not. I was the spokesman in this matter, so far as I was influential at all, of all sorts and kinds of Americans and of all parties and factions in America. I would be ashamed, my fellow countrymen, if I treated a matter of this sort with a single thought of so small a matter as the national elections of 1920. If anybody discusses this question on the basis of party advantage, I repudiate him as a fellow American. And in order to validate what I have said, I want to make one or two quotations from representatives of a party to which I do not belong. The first I shall make from a man who has for a long time been a member of the United States Senate. In May, 1916, just

about two years after the Great War began, this Senator, at a banquet at which I was myself present, uttered the following sentences:

I know, and no one I think can know better than one who has served long in the Senate which is charged with an important share of the ratification and confirmation of all treaties, no one can, I think, feel more deeply than I do the difficulties which confront us in the work which this League—that is, the great association extending throughout the country known as the League to Enforce Peace—undertakes, but the difficulties can not be overcome unless we try to overcome them. I believe much can be done. Probably it will be impossible to stop all wars, but it certainly will be possible to stop some wars, and thus diminish their number. The way in which this problem is to be worked out must be left to this League and to those who are giving this great subject the study which it deserves. I know the obstacles. I know how quickly we shall be met with the statement that this is a dangerous question which you are putting into your agreement, that no nation can submit to the judgment of other nations, and we must be careful at the beginning not to attempt too much. I know the difficulties which arise when we speak of anything which seems to involve an alliance, but I do not believe that when Washington warned us against entangling alliances he meant for one moment that we should not join with the other civilized nations of the world if a method could be found to diminish war and encourage peace.

It was a year ago, in delivering the chancellor's address at Union College, I made an argument on this theory, that if we were to promote international peace at the close of the present terrible war, if we were to restore international law as it must be restored, we must find some way in which the united forces of the nations could be put behind the cause of peace and law. I said then that my hearers might think that I was picturing a Utopia, but it is in the search for Utopias that great discoveries have been made. Not failure, but low aim, is the crime. This League certainly has the highest of all aims for the benefit of humanity, and because the pathway is sown with difficulties is no reason that we should turn from it.

The quotation is from the Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge. I read another quotation from one of the most energetic, practical, and distinguished leaders of the Republican Party, uttered in an article published in the New York *Times* in October, 1919:

The one permanent move for obtaining peace which has yet been suggested with any reasonable chance of obtaining its object is by

an agreement among the great powers, in which each should pledge itself not only to abide by the decisions of a common tribunal, but to back with force the decision of that common tribunal. The great civilized nations of the world which do possess force, actual or immediately potential, should combine by solemn agreement in a great world league for the peace of righteousness.

A very worthy utterance by Theodore Roosevelt. I am glad to align myself with such utterances as those. I subscribe to every word of them. And here in concrete form is the fulfillment of the plan which they advocate. We can not in reason, we can not as lovers of liberty, we can not as supporters of right turn away from it.

What are those who advise us to turn away from it afraid of? In the first place, they are afraid that it impairs in some way that long traditional policy of the United States which was embodied in the Monroe Doctrine, but how they can fear that I can not conceive, for the document expressly says in words which I am now quoting that nothing in this covenant shall be held to affect the validity of the Monroe Doctrine. The phrase was inserted under my own eye, at the suggestion—not of the phrase but the principle—of the Foreign Relations Committees of both Houses of Congress. I think I am justified in dismissing all fear that the Monroe Doctrine is in the least impaired. And what is the Monroe Doctrine? It is that no outside power shall attempt to impose its will in any form upon the Western Hemisphere, and that if it does the United States, acting upon its own initiative and alone, if it chooses, can resist and will resist the attempt. Could anything leave the United States freer as a champion of the independence of the Western Hemisphere than this world acknowledgment of the validity and potency of the Monroe Doctrine?

They are afraid that the League will in some way deal with our domestic affairs. The covenant expressly says that it will have no right to deal with the domestic affairs of any member of the League, and I can not imagine any-

thing more definite or satisfactory than that. There is no ambiguity about any part of this covenant, for the matter of that, but there is certainly no ambiguity about the statement concerning domestic affairs, for it is provided that if any matter brought before the council is found to be a matter which, under international law, lies within the exclusive jurisdiction of the State making the claim, the council shall dismiss consideration of it and shall not even make a report about it. And the subjects which are giving these gentlemen the most concern are agreed by all students of international law to be domestic questions; for example, immigration, naturalization, the tariff—these are the subjects most frequently spoken of. No one of those can be dealt with by the League of Nations, so far as the sovereignty of the United States is concerned. We have a perfectly clear field there, as we have in regard to the Monroe Doctrine.

It is feared that our delegates will be outvoted, because I am constantly hearing it said that the British Empire has six votes and we have one. I am perfectly content to have only one when the one counts six, and that is exactly the arrangement under the League. Let us examine that matter a little more particularly. Besides the vote of Great Britain herself, the other five votes are the votes of Canada, of South Africa, of Australia, of New Zealand, and of India. We ourselves were champions and advocates of giving a vote to Panama, of giving a vote to Cuba—both of them under the direction and protectorate of the United States—and if a vote was given to Panama and to Cuba, could it reasonably be denied to the great Dominion of Canada? Could it be denied to that stout Republic in South Africa, that is now living under a nation which did, indeed, overcome it at one time, but which did not dare retain its government in its hands, but turned it over to the very men whom it had fought? Could we deny it to Australia, that independent little Republic in the Pacific,

which has led the world in so many liberal reforms? Could it be denied New Zealand? Could we deny it to the hundreds of millions who live in India? But, having given these six votes, what are the facts? For you have been misled with regard to them. The League can take no active steps without the unanimous vote of all the nations represented on the council, added to a vote of the majority in the assembly itself. These six votes are in the assembly, not in the council. The assembly is not a voting body, except upon a limited number of questions, and whenever those questions are questions of action, the affirmative vote of every nation represented on the council is indispensable, and the United States is represented on the council. The six votes that you hear about can do nothing in the way of action without the consent of the United States. There are two matters in which the assembly can act, but I do not think we will be jealous of those. A majority of the assembly can admit new members into the League. A majority of the assembly can advise a member of the League to reconsider any treaty which in the opinion of the assembly of the League is apt to conflict with the operation of the League itself, but that is advice which can be disregarded, which has no validity of action in it, which has no compulsion of law in it. With the single exception of admitting new members to the League, there is no energy in the six votes which is not offset by the energy in the one vote of the United States, and I am more satisfied to be one and count six than to be six and count only six. This thing that has been talked about is a delusion. The United States is not easily frightened, and I dare say it is least easily frightened by things that are not true.

It is also feared that causes in which we are interested will be defeated. Well, the United States is interested in a great many causes, for the very interesting and compelling reason that the United States is made up out of all the civilized peoples of the world. There is not a na-

tional cause, my fellow citizens, which has not quickened the heartbeat of men in America. There is not a national cause which men in America do not understand, because they come of the same blood, they come of the same traditions, they recollect through long tradition the wrongs of their peoples, the hopes of their peoples, the passions of their peoples, and everywhere in America there are kinsmen to stand up and speak words of sympathy for great causes. For the first time in the history of the world, the League of Nations presents a forum, a world forum, where any one of these ambitions or aspirations can be brought to the consideration of mankind. Never before has this been possible. Never before has there been a jury of mankind to which nations could take their causes, whether they were weak or strong. You have heard a great deal about Article X of the covenant. Very well, after you have read it suppose you read Article XI. Article XI provides that it shall be the friendly right of any member of the League, big or little, strong or weak, to call attention to anything, anywhere, which is likely to disturb the peace of the world or the good understanding between nations upon which the peace of the world depends.

But what disturbs me, perhaps the only thing that disturbs me, my fellow countrymen, about the form which the opposition to the League is taking is this: Certain reservations, as they are called, are proposed which in effect—I am not now stopping to form an opinion as to whether that is the intention or not; I have no right to judge the intention of a man who has not stated what his intention is—which in effect amount to this, that the United States is unwilling to assume the same obligations under the covenant of the League that are assumed by the other members of the League; that the United States wants to disclaim any part in the responsibility which the other members of the League are assuming. I want to say with all the emphasis of which I am capable that that is unworthy of the honor

of the United States. The principle of justice, the principle of right, the principle of international amity is this, that there is not only an imaginary but a real equality of standing and right among all the sovereign peoples of the world. I do not care to defend the rights of a people if I must regard them as my inferior, if I must do so with condescension, if I must do so because I am strong and they are weak. You know the men, and the women, too, I dare say, who are respectful only to those whom they regard as their social equals or their industrial equals and of whom they are more or less afraid, who will not exercise the same amenities and the same consideration for those whom they deem beneath them. Such people do not belong in democratic society, for one thing, and, for another, their whole point of view is perverted; they are incapable of justice, because the foundation of justice is that the weakest has the same rights as the strongest. I must admit, my fellow citizens, and you can not deny—and I admit it with a certain profound regret not only but with a touch of shame—that while that is the theory of democratic institutions it is not always the practice. The weak do not always fare as well as the strong, the poor do not always get the same advantage of justice that the rich get; but that is due to the passions and imperfections of human nature. The foundation of the law, the glory of the law, is that the weakest is equal to the strongest in matter of right and privilege, and the goal to which we are constantly though stumblingly and with mistakes striving to go forward is the goal of actual equality, of actual justice, upon the basis of equality of rights, and unless you are going to establish the society of nations upon the actual foundation of equality, unless the United States is going to assume the same responsibility and just as much responsibility as the other nations of the world we ought not to commit the mockery of going into the arrangement at all.

I will not join in claiming under the name of justice an unjust position of privilege for the country I love and honor. Neither am I afraid of responsibility. Neither will I scuttle. Neither will I be a little American. America, in her make-up, in her purposes, in her principles, is the biggest thing in the world, and she must measure up to the measure of the world. I will be no party in belittling her. I will be no party in saying that America is afraid of responsibilities which I know she can carry and in which in carrying I am sure she shall lead the world. Why, if we were to decline to go into this humane arrangement we would be declining the invitation which all the world extends to us to lead them in the enterprise of liberty and of justice. I, for one, will not decline that invitation. I, for one, believe more profoundly than in anything else human in the destiny of the United States. I believe that she has a spiritual energy in her which no other nation can contribute to the liberation of mankind, and I know that the heart of America is stronger than her business calculations. That is what the world found out when we went into the war. When we went into the war there was not a nation in the world that did not believe we were more interested in making money out of it than in serving the cause of liberty. And when we went in, in those few months the whole world stood at amaze and ended with an enthusiastic conversion. They now believe that America will stand by anybody that is fighting for justice and for right, and we shall not disappoint them.

The age is opening, my fellow citizens, upon a new scene. We are substituting in this covenant—and this is the main purpose of it—arbitration and discussion for war. Senator Lodge says if we can stop some wars it is worth while. If you want insurance against war, I take it you would rather have 10 per cent insurance than none; I take it that you would be delighted with 50 per cent insurance; and here I verily believe is 99 per cent insurance against

war. Here are all the great fighting nations of the world, with the exception of Germany—because for the time being Germany is not a great fighting nation—solemnly covenant with one another that they will never go to war without first having either submitted the matter in dispute to arbitration and bound themselves to abide by the verdict, or, having submitted it to discussion by the council of the League of Nations in which case they will lay all the facts and documents by publication before the world, wait six months for the opinion of the council, and if they are dissatisfied with that opinion—for they are not bound by it —they will wait another three months before they go to war. There is a period of nine months of the process which is absolutely destructive of unrighteous causes—exposure to public opinion. When I find a man who in a public matter will not state his side of the case, and state it fully, I know that his side of the case is the losing side, that he dare not state it.

At the heart of most of our industrial difficulties, my fellow citizens, and most of you are witness to this, lies the unwillingness of men to get together and talk it over. Half of the temper which now exists between those who perform labour and those who direct labour is due to the fact that those who direct labour will not talk differences over with the men whom they employ, and I am in every such instance convinced that they are wrong and dare not talk it over. Not only that, but every time the two sides do get together and talk it over they come out of the conference in a different temper from that with which they went in. There is nothing that softens the attitude of men like really, frankly laying their minds alongside of each other and their characters alongside of each other and making a fair and manly and open comparison. That is what all the great fighting nations of the world agree to with every matter of difference between them. They put it either before a jury by whom they are bound or before a jury

which will publish all the facts to mankind and express a frank opinion regarding it.

You have here what the world must have, what America went into this war to obtain. You have here an estoppel of the brutal, sudden impulse of war. You have here a restraint upon the passions of ambitious nations. You here have a safeguard of the liberty of weak nations, and the world is at last ready to stand up and in calm counsel discuss the fortunes of men and women and children everywhere. Why, my fellow citizens, nothing brings a lump into my throat quicker on this journey I am taking than to see the thronging children that are everywhere the first, just out of childish curiosity and glee, no doubt, to crowd up to the train when it stops, because I know that if by any chance we should not win this great fight for the League of Nations it would be their death warrant. They belong to the generation which would then have to fight the final war, and in that final war there would not be merely seven and a half million men slain. The very existence of civilization would be in the balance, and I for one dare not fare the responsibility of defeating the very purpose for which we sent our gallant men overseas.

ADDRESS AT HOTEL ALEXANDRIA, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

SEPTEMBER 20, 1919

Mr. Toastmaster and Ladies and Gentlemen:

There is only one thing, my fellow citizens, that has daunted me on this trip. My good father used to teach me that you can not reason out of a man what reason did not put in him, and, suspecting—may I not say knowing—that much of the argument directed against the League of Nations is not based upon reason, I must say I have sometimes been puzzled how to combat it, because it is true, as your toastmaster has said, that there is a great constructive

plan presented, and no man in the presence of the present critical situation of mankind has the right to oppose any constructive plan except by a better constructive plan. I will say now that I am ready to take ship again and carry back to Paris any constructive proposals which appear a suitable and better substitute for those which have been made.

There is a peculiarity about this constructive plan which ought, I think, to facilitate our acceptance of it. It is laid out in every part upon American principles. Everybody knows that the principles of peace proposed by America were adopted, were adopted as the basis of the armistice and have been acted upon as the basis of the peace, and there is a circumstance about those American principles which gives me absolute confidence in them. They were not principles which I originated. They would have none of the strength in them that they have if they had been of individual origination. I remember how anxiously I watched the movements of opinion in this country during the months immediately preceding our entrance into the war. Again and again I put this question to the men who sat around the board at which the Cabinet meets. They represented different parts of the country, they were in touch with the opinion in different parts of the United States, and I would frequently say to them, "How do you think the people feel with regard to our relation to this war?" And I remember, one day one of them said, "Mr. President, I think that they are ready to do anything you suggest." I said, "That is not what I am waiting for. That is not enough. If they do not go in of their own impulse, no impulse that I can supply will suffice, and I must wait until I know that I am their spokesman. I must wait until I know that I am interpreting their purpose. Then I will know that I have got an irresistible power behind me." And that is exactly what happened.

That is what is now appreciated as it was not at first

appreciated on the other side of the sea. They wondered and wondered why we did not come in. They had come to the cynical conclusion that we did not come in because we were making money out of the war and did not want to spoil the profitable game; and then at last they saw what we were waiting for, in order that the whole plot of the German purpose should develop, in order that we might see how the intrigue of that plot had penetrated our own life, how the poison was spreading, and how it was nothing less than a design against the freedom of the world. They knew that when America once saw that she would throw her power in with those who were going to redeem the world. And at every point of the discussion I was attempting to be the mouthpiece of what I understood right-thinking and forward-thinking and just-thinking men without regard to party or section in the United States to be purposing and conceiving, and it was the consciousness in Europe that that was the case that made it possible to construct the peace upon American principles. The American principles were not only accepted. They were acted upon, and when I came back to this country with that plan I think you will bear me out that the nation was prepared to accept it. I have no doubt, and I have not met anybody who had any well-reasoned doubt, that if immediate action could have been secured upon the treaty at that time only a negligible percentage of our people would have objected to its acceptance, without a single change in either the wording or the punctuation. But then something intervened, and, my fellow citizens, I am not only not going to try to analyze what that was, I am not going to allow my own judgment to be formed as regards what it was. I do not understand it, but there is a certain part of it that I do understand. It is to the immediate interest of Germany to separate us from our associates in the war, and I know that the opposition to the treaty is most acceptable in those quarters of the country where pro-Ger-

man sentiment was strongest. I know that all over the country German propaganda has lifted its hideous head again, and I hear the hiss of it on every side.

When gentlemen speak of isolation, they forget we would have a companion. There would be another isolated nation, and that is Germany. They forget that we would be in the judgment of the world in the same class and at the same disadvantage as Germany. I mean sentimental disadvantage. We would be regarded as having withdrawn our coöperation from that concerted purpose of mankind which was recently conceived and exercised for the liberation of mankind, and Germany would be the only nation in the world to profit by it. I have no doubt there are scores of business men present. Do you think we would profit materially by isolating ourselves and centering upon ourselves the hostility and suspicion and resistance of all the liberal minds in the world? Do you think that if, after having won the absolute confidence of the world and excited the hope of the world, we would lead if we should turn away from them and say, "No; we do not care to be associated with you any longer; we are going to play a lone hand; we are going to play it for our single advantage"? Do you think after that there is a very good psychology for business, there is a very good psychology for credit? Do you think that throws foreign markets open to you? Do you remember what happened just before we went into the war? There was a conference in Paris, the object of which was to unite the peoples fighting against Germany in an economic combination which would be exclusively for their own benefit. It is possible now for those powers to organize and combine in respect of the purchase of raw materials, and if the foreign market for our raw materials is united, we will have to sell at the price that they are willing to pay or not sell at all. Unless you go into the great economic partnership with the world, you have the rest of the world economically combined against

you. So that if you bring the thing down to this lowest of all bases, the bases of material self-interest, you lose in the game, and, for my part, I am free to say that you ought to lose.

We are told that we are strong and they are weak; that we still have economic or financial independence and they have not. Why, my fellow citizens, what does that mean? That means that they went into the redemption of the freedom of the world sooner than we did and gave everything that they had to redeem it. And now we, because we did not go in so soon or lose so much, want to make profit of the redeemers! The thing is hideous. The thing is unworthy of every tradition of America. I speak of it not because I think that sort of thing takes the least hold upon the consciousness or the purpose of America but because it is a pleasure to condemn so ugly a thing.

When we look at the objections which these gentlemen make, I have found in going about the country that the result has been that in the greater part of the United States the people do not know what is in the treaty. To my great surprise, I have had to stand up and expound the treaty—tell the people what is in it—and I have had man after man say, "Why, we never dreamed that those things were in the treaty. We never heard anything about that." No; you never heard anything about the greater part of the enterprise; you only heard about some of the alleged aspects of the method in which the enterprise was to be carried out. That is all you have heard about. I remember saying—and I believe it was the thought of America—that this was a people's war and the treaty must be a people's peace. That is exactly what this peace treaty proposes. For the first time in the history of civilized society, a great international convention, made up of the leading statesmen of the world, has proposed a settlement which is for the benefit of the weak and not for the benefit of the strong. It is for the benefit of peoples who could

not have liberated themselves, whose weakness was profitable to the ambitious and imperialistic nations, whose weakness had been traded in by every cabinet in Europe; and yet these very cabinets represented at the table in Paris were unanimous in the conviction that the people's day had come and that it was not their right to dispose of the fortunes of people without the consent of those people themselves.

At the front of this great settlement they put the only thing that will preserve it. You can not set weak peoples up in independence and then leave them to be preyed upon. You can not give a false gift. You can not give to people rights which they never enjoyed before and say, "Now, keep them if you can." That is an Indian gift. That is a gift which can not be kept. If you have a really humane purpose and a real knowledge of the conditions of peace in the world, you will have to say, "This is the settlement and we guarantee its continuance." There is only one honorable course when you have won a cause, to see that it stays won and nobody interferes with or disturbs the results. That is the purpose of the much-discussed Article X in the covenant of the League of Nations. It is the Monroe Doctrine applied to the world. Ever since Mr. Monroe uttered his famous doctrine we have said to the world, "We will respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and the political independence of every state in the Western Hemisphere," and those are practically the words of Article X. Under Article X all the members of the League engage to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of the other member states, and if that guaranty is not forthcoming the whole structure of peace will crumble, because you can not point out a great war that has not begun by a violation of that principle; that has not begun by the intention to impair the territorial integrity or to interfere

with the political independence of some body of people of some nation. It was the heart of the Pan-German plan. It is the heart of every imperialistic plan, because imperialism is the design to control the destinies of people who did not choose you to control them. It is the principle of domination. It is at the opposite extreme from the principle of self-determination and self-government, and in that same covenant of the League of Nations is the provision that only self-governing states shall be admitted to the membership of the League. No influence shall be injected there which is not sympathetic with the fundamental principle, namely, that ancient and noble principle that underlies our institutions, that all just government depends upon the consent of the governed.

You have no choice, my fellow citizens, because the peoples of the world, even those that slept, are awake. There is not a country in the world where the great mass of mankind is not now aware of its rights and determined to have them at any cost, and the present universal unrest in the world, which renders return to normal conditions impossible so long as it continues, will not stop until men are assured by some arrangement they can believe in that their rights will be protected and that they can go about the normal production of the necessaries of life and begin to enjoy the ordinary pleasures and privileges of life without the constant shadow of some cloud of terror over them, some threat of injustice, some tyranny of control. Men are not going to stand it. If you want to quiet the world, you have got to reassure the world, and the only way in which you can reassure it is to let it know that all the great fighting powers of the world are going to maintain that quiet, that the fighting power is no longer to be directed toward aggression, but is to be directed toward protection. And every great fighting nation in the world will be in the League—because Germany for the time being is not a great fighting power. That great nation of over 60,000,000

people has consented in the treaty to reduce its standing armed force to 100,000 men and to give up all the war material over and above what is necessary to maintain an army of 100,000 men; so that for the time being we may exclude Germany from the list of the fighting nations of the world. The whole power of the world is now offered to mankind for the maintenance of peace, and for the maintenance of peace by the very processes we have all professed to believe in, by substituting arbitration and discussion for war, by substituting the judgment of mankind for the force of arms. I say without qualification that every nation that is not afraid of the judgment of mankind will go into this arrangement. There is nothing for any nation to lose whose purposes are right and whose cause is just. The only nations that need fear to go into it are those that have designs which are illegitimate, those which have designs that are inconsistent with justice and are the opposite of peace.

The whole freedom of the world not only, but the whole peace of mind of the world, depends upon the choice of America, because without America in this arrangement the world will not be reassured. I can testify to that. I can testify that no impression was borne in deeper upon me on the other side of the water than that no great free peoples suspected the United States of ulterior designs, and that every nation, the weakest among them, felt that its fortunes would be safe if intrusted to the guidance of America; that America would not impose upon it. At the peace table one of the reasons why American advice constantly prevailed, as it did, was that our experts—our financial experts, our economic experts, and all the rest of us, for you must remember that the work of the conference was not done exclusively by the men whose names you all read about every day; it was done in the most intensive labor of experts of every sort who sat down together and got down to the hardpan of every subject that they had to

deal with—were known to be disinterested, and in nine cases out of ten, after a long series of debates and interchanges of views and counterproposals, it was usually the American proposal that was adopted. That was because the American experts came at last into this position of advantage, they had convinced everybody that they were not trying to work anything, that they were not thinking of something that they did not disclose, that they wanted all the cards on the table, and that they wanted to deal with nothing but facts. They were not dealing with national ambitions, they were not trying to disappoint anybody, and they were not trying to stack the cards for anybody. It was that conviction, and that only, which led to the success of American counsel in Paris.

Is not that a worthy heritage for people who set up a great free nation on this continent in order to lead men in the ways of justice and of liberty? My heart was filled with a profound pride when I realized how America was regarded, and my only fear was that we who were over there would not have wisdom enough to play the part. Delegations from literally all parts of the world came to seek interviews with me as the spokesman of America, and there was always a plea that America should lead; that America should suggest. I remember saying to one of the delegations, which seemed to me more childlike in its confidence than the rest, "I beg that you gentlemen will not expect the impossible. America will do everything that she can, but she can not do some of the things that you are expecting of her. My chief fear is to disappoint, because you are expecting what can not be realized." My fear was not that America would not prove true to herself, but that the things expected of her were so ideal that in this practical world, full of obstacles, it would be impossible to realize the expectation. There was in the background the infinite gratification at the reputation and confidence that this country had won.

The world is in that situation industrially, economically, politically. The world will be absolutely in despair if America deserts it. But the thing is inconceivable. America is not going to desert it. The people of America are not going to desert it. The job is to get that into the consciousness of men who do not understand it. The job is to restore some of our fellow citizens to that large sort of sanity which makes a man bigger than himself.

You know, you have been told, that Washington advised us against entangling alliances, and gentlemen have used that as an argument against the League of Nations. What Washington had in mind was exactly what these gentlemen want to lead us back to. The day we have left behind us was a day of alliances. It was a day of balances of power. It was a day of "every nation take care of itself or make a partnership with some other nation or group of nations to hold the peace of the world steady or to dominate the weaker portions of the world." Those were the days of alliances. This project of the League of Nations is a great process of disentanglement. I was reading only this morning what a friend of mine reminded me of, a speech that President McKinley made the day before he was assassinated, and in several passages of that speech you see the dawn of this expectation in his humane mind. His whole thought was against isolation. His whole thought was that we had by process of circumstance, as well as of interest, become partners with the rest of the world. His thought was that the world had grown little by quickened methods of intercommunication. His whole thought was that the better we knew each other and the closer we drew together, the more certain it would be that the processes of arbitration would be adopted; that men would not fight but would talk things over; that they would realize their community of interest; and shot all through that speech you see the morning light of just such a day as this. It would look as if the man had been given a vision just before he died—one of

the sweetest and most humane souls that have been prominent in our affairs, a man who thought with his head and with his heart. This new day was dawning upon his heart, and his intelligence was beginning to draw the lines of the new picture which has been completed and sketched in a constructive document that we shall adopt and that, having adopted it, we shall find to reflect a new glory upon the things that we did. Then what significance will attach to the boy's sword or the boy's musket over the mantelpiece—not merely that he beat Germany, but that he redeemed the world.

ADDRESS AT AUDITORIUM, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

SEPTEMBER 20, 1919

Mr. Mayor, Mrs. Cowles, My Fellow Countrymen:

I esteem it a great privilege to stand before this audience, and I esteem it one of the most interesting occasions that I have had to expound a theme so great that I am always afraid that I am inadequate to its exposition. I esteem it a privilege to be in the presence that I find myself in, on the stage with this committee of gentlemen representing the nations with whom we have been associated in the war, with these men who saved the Union and with these men who saved the world.

I feel that there is a certain sense in which I am rendering my account to the soldiers and sailors whose Commander-in-Chief I have been, for I sent them across the sea believing that their errand was not only to defeat Germany, but also to redeem the world from the danger to which Germany had exposed it, to make the world a place in which arbitration, discussion, the processes of peace, the processes of justice should supplant the brutal processes of war. I came back from the other side proud that I was bringing with me a document which contained a great con-

structive plan to accomplish that very thing. It is a matter of unaffected amazement on my part, my fellow citizens, that there should be men in high station who oppose its adoption. It is a matter of amazement that they should devote their scrutiny to certain details and forget the majesty of the plan, that they should actually have made it necessary that I should go throughout the country telling the people of the United States what is in the treaty of peace. For they have not told you. They have given you no conception of its scope. They have not expounded its objects. They have not shown you how it is a people's and not a statesmen's peace. They have not shown you how at its heart lies the liberation of nations. They have not shown you that in it is the redemption of our promise that we were fighting for the right of the weak and not for the power of the strong. These promises are redeemed in that great document, these hopes are realized, and the only buttress for that great structure is the League of Nations. If that should fail, there is no guaranty that any part of the settlement will stand. If that should fail, nations will once more sink back into that slough of despond in which they formerly struggled, suspecting one another, rivaling one another in preparation for war, intriguing against one another, plotting against the weak in order to supplement the power of the strong.

And they did more than that, because mankind is now aware that the rights of the greater portion of mankind have not been safeguarded and regarded. Do not for a moment suppose that the universal unrest in the world at the present time, my fellow citizens, is due to any whim, to any newborn passion, to any newly discovered ambition. It is due to the fact, the sad, the tragic fact, that great bodies of men have throughout the ages been denied the mere rights of humanity. The peoples of the world are tired of a time with governments that exploit their people, and they are determined to have, by one process or another,

that concerted order of conciliation and debate and conference which is set up in the great document that we know as the covenant of the League of Nations. The heart of that document is not in the mere details that you have heard about. The heard of that document is that every great fighting nation in the world—for Germany at present is not a great fighting nation—solemnly engages that it will never resort to war without first having done one or other of two things, either submitted the matter in dispute to arbitration, in which case it agrees to abide by the verdict, or, if it does not choose to submit it to arbitration, submit it to the discussion and examination of the council of the League of Nations, before whom it promises to lay all the documents, to whom it promises to disclose all the pertinent facts, by whom it agrees all the documents and facts shall be published and laid before the opinion of the world. It agrees that six months shall be allowed for the examination of those documents and facts by the council of the League and that, even if it is dissatisfied with the opinion finally uttered it will still not resort to war until three months after the opinion has been rendered. All agree that there shall be nine months of deliberate discussion and frank weighing of the merits of the case before the whole jury of mankind before they will go to war.

If any one of them disregards that promise and refuses to submit the question in dispute either to arbitration or to discussion, or goes to war within less than the nine months, then there is an automatic penalty that is applied, more effective, I take leave to say, than war itself, namely, the application of an absolute boycott. The nation that disregards that promise, we all agree, shall be isolated; shall be denied the right to ship out goods or to ship them in, to exchange telegraphic messages or messages by mail, to have any dealings of any kind with the citizens of the other members of the League. First, the pressure of opinion and then the compelling pressure of economic necessity—those

are the great bulwarks of peace. Do you say they are not sufficient? Autocratic governments are excluded henceforth from respectable society. It is provided in the covenant of the League of Nations that only self-governing peoples shall be admitted to its membership, and the reason that Germany is for the time being excluded is that we want to wait and see whether she really has changed permanently her form of constitution and her habit of government. If she has changed her mind in reality, if her great people have taken charge of their own affairs and will prove it to us, they are entitled to come into respectable society and join the League of Nations. Until then they are on probation, and to hear some of them talk now you would think the probation had to be rather long, because they do not seem to have repented of their essential purpose.

Now, offset against this, my fellow citizens, some of the things that are being said about the covenant of the League and about the treaty. I want to begin with one of the central objections which are made to the treaty, for I have come here disposed to business. I do not want to indulge in generalities. I do not want to dwell more than it is proper to dwell upon the great ideal purposes that lie behind this peace and this covenant. I want to contrast some things that have been said with the real facts. There is nothing that is formidable in this world in public affairs except facts. Talk does not matter.

Let us take up some of these things. In the first place, there is that very complex question of the cession of the rights which Germany formerly enjoyed in Shantung Province, in China, and which the treaty transfers to Japan. The only way in which to clear this matter up is to know what lies back of it. Let me recall some circumstances which probably most of you have forgotten. I have to go back to the year 1898, for it was in March of that year that these cessions which formerly belonged to

Germany were transferred to her by the Government of China. What had happened was that two German missionaries in China had been murdered. The central Government at Peking had done everything that was in its power to do to quiet the local disturbances, to allay the local prejudice against foreigners which led to the murders, but had been unable to do so, and the German Government held them responsible, nevertheless, for the murder of the missionaries. It was not the missionaries that the German Government was interested in. That was a pretext. Ah, my fellow citizens, how often we have made Christianity an excuse for wrong! How often in the name of protecting what was sacred we have done what was tragically wrong! That was what Germany did. She insisted that, because this thing had happened for which the Peking Government could not really with justice be held responsible, a very large and important part of one of the richest Provinces of China should be ceded to her for sovereign control, for a period of ninety-nine years, that she should have the right to penetrate the interior of that Province with a railway, and that she should have the right to exploit any ores that lay within thirty miles either side of that railway. She forced the Peking Government to say that they did it in gratitude to the German Government for certain services which she was supposed to have rendered but never did render. That was the beginning. I do not know whether any of the gentlemen who are criticizing the present Shantung settlement were in public affairs at that time or not, but I will tell you what happened, so far as this Government was concerned.

One of the most enlightened and humane Presidents we have ever had was at the head of the Government—William McKinley, a man who loved his fellow men and believed in justice—and associated with him was one of our ablest Secretaries of State—Mr. John Hay. The state of international law was such then that they did not feel at liberty

to make even a protest against these concessions to Germany. Neither did they make any protest when, immediately following that, similar concessions were made to Russia, to Great Britain, and to France. It was almost immediately after that that China granted to Russia the right of the possession and control of Port Arthur and a portion of the region of Ta-lien-wan. Then England, not wishing to be outdone, although she had similar rights elsewhere in China, insisted upon a similar concession and got Wei-hai-wei. Then France insisted that she must have a port, and got it for ninety-nine years. Not against one of those did the Government of the United States make any protest whatever. They only insisted that the door should not be shut in any of these regions against the trade of the United States. You have heard of Mr. Hay's policy of the open door. That was his policy of the open door—not the open door to the rights of China, but the open door to the goods of America. I want you to understand, my fellow countrymen, I am not criticizing this because, until we adopt the covenant of the League of Nations, it is an unfriendly act for any government to interfere in the affairs of any other unless its own interests are immediately concerned. The only thing Mr. McKinley and Mr. Hay were at liberty to do was to call attention to the fact that the trade of the United States might be unfavorably affected and insist that in no circumstances it should be. They got from all of these powers the promise that it should not be—a promise which was more or less kept. Following that came the war between Russia and Japan, and at the close of that war Japan got Port Arthur and all the rights which Russia enjoyed in China, just as she is now getting Shantung and the rights her recently defeated enemy had in China—an exactly similar operation. That peace that gave her Port Arthur was concluded, as you know, on the territory of the United States—at Portsmouth, N. H. Nobody dreamed of protesting against that. Japan had

beaten Russia. Port Arthur did not at that time belong to China; it belonged for the period of the lease to Russia, and Japan was ceded what Japan had taken by the well-recognized processes of war.

Very well, at the opening of this war, Japan went and took Kiaochow and supplanted Germany in Shantung Province. The whole process is repeated, but repeated with a new sanction. In the meantime, after this present war began, England and France, not at the same time, but successively, feeling that it was essential that they should have the assistance of Japan on the Pacific, agreed that if Japan would go into this war and take whatever Germany had in the Pacific she should retain everything north of the equator which had belonged to Germany. That treaty now stands. That treaty absolutely binds Great Britain and France. Great Britain and France can not in honor, having offered Japan this inducement to enter the war and to continue her operations, consent to an elimination of the Shantung provision from the present treaty. Very well, let us put these gentlemen who are objecting to the Shantung settlement to the test. Are they ready to fight Great Britain and France and Japan, who will have to stand together, in order to get this Province back for China? I know they are not, and their interest in China is not the interest of assisting China, but of defeating the treaty. They know beforehand that a modification of the treaty in that respect can not be obtained, and they are insisting upon what they know is impossible; but if they ratify the treaty and accept the covenant of the League of Nations they do put themselves in a position to assist China. They put themselves in that position for the very first time in the history of international engagements. They change the whole faith of international affairs, because after you have read the much debated Article X of the covenant I advise you to read Article XI. Article XI says that it shall be the friendly right of any member of

the League to call attention at any time to anything, anywhere, that threatens to disturb the peace of the world or the good understanding between nations upon which the peace of the world depends. That in itself constitutes a revolution in international relationships. Anything that affects the peace of any part of the world is the business of every nation. It does not have simply to insist that its trade shall not be interfered with; it has the right to insist that the rights of mankind shall not be interfered with. Not only that, but back of this provision with regard to Shantung lies, as everybody knows or ought to know, a very honorable promise which was made by the Government of Japan in my presence in Paris, namely, that just as soon as possible after the ratification of this treaty they will return to China all sovereign rights in the Province of Shantung. Great Britain has not promised to return Weihai-wei; France has not promised to return her part. Japan has promised to relinquish all the sovereign rights acquired by Germany for the remaining seventy-eight of the ninety-nine years of the lease, and to retain only what other Governments have in many other parts of China, namely, the right to build and operate the railway under a corporation and to exploit the mines in the immediate neighborhood of that railway. In other words, she retains only the rights of economic concessionaires. Personally, I am frank to say that I think all of these nations have invaded some of the essential rights of China by going too far in the concessions which they have demanded, but that is an old story now, and we are beginning a new story. In the new story we all have the right to talk about what they have been doing and to convince them, by the pressure of the public opinion of the world, that a different course of action would be just and right. I am for helping China and not turning away from the only way in which I can help her. Those are the facts about Shantung. Doesn't the thing look a little different?

Another thing that is giving some of our fellow countrymen pangs of some sort—pangs of jealousy, perhaps—is that, as they put it, Great Britain has six votes in the League and we have only one. Well, our one vote, it happens, counts just as heavily as if every one of our states were represented and we had forty-eight, because it happens, though these gentlemen have overlooked it, that the assembly is not an independent voting body. Great Britain has only one representative and one vote in the council of the League of Nations, which originates all action, and its six votes are in the assembly, which is a debating and not an executive body. In every matter in which the assembly can vote along with the council it is necessary that all the nations represented on the council should concur in the affirmative vote to make it valid, so that in every vote, no matter how many concur in it in the assembly, in order for it to become valid, it is necessary that the United States should vote aye.

Inasmuch as the assembly is a debating body, that is the place where this exposure that I have talked about to the open air is to occur. It would not be wise for anybody to go into the assembly with purposes that will not bear exposure, because that is the great cooling process of the world; that is the great place where gases are to be burned off. I ask you, in debating the affairs of mankind, would it have been fair to give Panama a vote, as she will have, Cuba a vote, both of them very much under the influence of the United States, and not give a vote to the Dominion of Canada, to that great energetic Republic in South Africa, to that place from which so many liberal ideas and liberal actions have come, that stout little Commonwealth of Australia? When I was in Paris the men I could not tell apart, except by their hats, were the Americans and the Australians. They both had the swing of fellows who say, "The gang is all here, what do we care?" Could we deny a vote to that other little self-governing

nation, for it practically is such in everything but its foreign affairs, New Zealand, or to those toiling—I was about to say uncounted—millions in India? Would you want to deprive these great communities of a voice in the debate? My fellow citizens, it is a proposition which has never been stated, because to state it answers it. But they can not outvote us. If we had forty-eight votes in the assembly, they would not count any more than our one, because they would have to be combined, and it is easier to combine one than to combine forty-eight. The vote of the United States is potential to prevent anything that the United States does not care to approve. All this nonsense about six votes and one vote can be dismissed and you can sleep with perfect quiet. In order that I may not be said to have misled you, I must say that there is one matter upon which the assembly can vote, and which it can decide by a two-thirds majority without the concurrence of all the states represented in the council, and that is the admission of new members to the League.

Then, there is that passion that some gentlemen have conceived, that we should never live with anybody else. You can call it the policy of isolation or the policy of taking care of yourself, or you can give any name you choose to what is thoroughly impossible and selfish. I say it is impossible, my fellow citizens. When men tell you that we are, by going into the League of Nations, reversing the policy of the United States, they have not thought the thing out. The statement is not true. The facts of the world have changed. It is impossible for the United States to be isolated. It is impossible for the United States to play a lone hand, because it has gone partners with all the rest of the world with regard to every great interest that it is connected with. What are you going to do? Give up your foreign markets? Give up your influence in the affairs of other nations and arm yourselves to the teeth and double your taxes and be ready to spring instead of ready

to cooperate? We are tied to the rest of the world by kinship, by sympathy, by interest in every great enterprise of human affairs. The United States has become the economic center of the world, the financial center. Our economic engagements run everywhere, into every part of the globe. Our assistance is essential to the establishment of normal conditions throughout the world. Our advice is constantly sought. Our standards of labour are being extended to all parts of the world just so fast as they can be extended. America is the breeding center for all the ideas that are now going to fecundate the great future. You can no more separate yourselves from the rest of the world than you can take all the tender roots of a great tree out of the earth and expect the tree to live. All the tendrils of our life, economic and social and every other, are interlaced in a way that is inextricable with the similar tendrils of the rest of mankind. The only question which these gentlemen can ask us to decide is this: Shall we exercise our influence in the world, which can henceforth be a profound and controlling influence, at a great advantage or at an insuperable disadvantage? That is the only question that you can ask. As I put it the other night, you have got this choice: You have got to be either provincials, little Americans, or big Americans, statesmen. You have got to be either ostriches with your heads in the sand or eagles. I doubt if the comparison, with the head in the sands, is a good one, because I think even an ostrich can think in the sand. What he does not know is that people are looking at the rest of him. Our choice is in the bird kingdom, and I have in my mind's eye a future in which it will seem that the eagle has been misused. You know that it was a double-headed eagle that represented the power of Austria-Hungary, you have heard of the eagles of Germany, but the only proper symbol of the eagle is the symbol for which we use it—as the bird of liberty and justice and peace.

I want to put it as a business proposition, if I am obliged to come down as low as that, for I do not like in debating the great traditions of a free people to bring the debate down to the basis of dollars and cents; but if you want to bring it down to that, if anybody wants to bring it down to that, reason it out on that line. Is it easier to trade with a man who suspects and dislikes you or with one who trusts you? Is it easier to deal with a man with a grouch or with a man who opens his mind and his opportunities to you and treats you like a partner and a friend? There is nothing which can more certainly put a drop of acid into every relationship we have in the world than if we now desert our former associates in this war. That is exactly what we should be doing if we rejected this treaty, and that is exactly what, speaking unwisely and too soon, the German leaders have apprised us that they want us to do. No part of the world has been so pleased by our present hesitation as the leaders of Germany, because their hope from the first has been that sooner or later we would fall out with our associates. Their hope was to divide us before the fighting stopped, and now their hope is to divide us after the fighting. You read how a former German privy councillor, I believe he was, said in an interview the other day that these debates in the Senate looked to him like the dawn of a new day. A new day for the world? No; a new day for the hopes of Germany, because he saw what anybody can see who lifts his eyes and looks in the future—two isolated nations; one isolated nation on probation, and then two, the other a nation infinitely trusted, infinitely believed in, that had given magnificent purpose of its mettle and of its trustworthiness, now drawing selfishly and suspiciously apart and saying, "You may deceive us, you may draw us into broils, you may get us into trouble; we will take care of ourselves, we will trade with you and we will trade on you." The thing is inconceivable. America is no quitter, and least of all is she a quitter in a great

moral enterprise where her conscience is involved. The only immortal thing about America is her conscience. America is not going to be immortal because she has immense wealth. Other great nations had immense wealth and went down in decay and disgrace, because they had nothing else. America is great because of the ideas she has conceived. America is great because of the purposes she has set herself to achieve. America is great because she has seen visions that other nations have not seen, and the one enterprise that does engage the steadfast loyalty and support of the United States is an enterprise for the liberty of mankind.

How can we make the purpose evident? I was saying in one place tonight that my dear father had once taught me that there was no use trying to reason out of a man what reason did not put in him, and yet here to-night I am trying to apply the remedy of reason. We must look about and find some other remedy, because in matters of this sort remedies are always homeopathic—like must cure like. Men must be made to see the great impulses of the nation in such a fashion that they will not dare to resist them. I do not mean by any threat of political disaster. Why, my fellow citizens, may I indulge in a confidence? I have had men politically disposed say to me, as a Democrat, "This is all to the good. These leaders of the Republican Party in Washington are going to ruin the party." They seem to think that I will be pleased. I do not want to see the great Republican Party misrepresented and misled. I do not want to see any advantage reaped by the party I am a member of because another great party has been misrepresented, because I believe in the loyalty and Americanism and high ideals of my fellow citizens who are Republicans just as much as I believe in those things in Democrats. It seems almost absurd to say that; of course I do. When we get to the borders of the United States we are neither Republicans nor Democrats. It is

our privilege to scrap inside the family just as much as we please, but it is our duty as a nation in those great matters of international concern which distinguish us to subordinate all such differences and to be a united family and all speak with one voice what we all know to be the high conceptions of American manhood and womanhood.

Address at Reno, Nev.

September 22, 1919

Governor Boyle, Mr. Chairman, My Fellow Countrymen:

The Governor and your chairman have both alluded to the fact that it does not often happen that the President comes to Nevada. Speaking for this President, I can say that it was not because he did not want to come to Nevada more than once, because from the first, when I have studied the movements of the history of this great country, nothing has fascinated me so much or seemed so characteristic of that history as the movement to the frontier, the constant spirit of adventure, the constant action forward. A wit in the East recently said, explaining the fact that we were able to train a great army so rapidly, that it was so much easier to train an American army than any other because you had to train them to go only one way. That has been true of America and of the movement of population. It has always been one way. They have never been returning tides. They have always been advancing tides, and at the front of the advancing tide have always been the most adventurous spirits, the most originative spirits, the men who were ready to go anywhere and to take up any fortune to advance the things that they believed in and desired. Therefore, it is with a sense of exhilaration that I find myself in this community, which your Governor has described as still a frontier community. You are a characteristic part of this great country which we all love.

And it is the more delightful to look at your individual aspect, because the subject that I have come to speak about is a forward-looking subject. Some of the critics of the League of Nations have their eyes over their shoulders; they are looking backward. I think that is the reason they are stumbling all the time; they are always striking their feet against obstacles which everybody sees and avoids and which do not lie in the real path of the progress of civilization. Their power to divert, or to pervert, the view of this whole thing has made it necessary for me repeatedly on this journey to take the liberty that I am going to take with you tonight, of telling you just what kind of a treaty this is. Very few of them have been at pains to do that. Very few of them have given their audiences or the country at large any conception of what this great document contains or of what its origin and purpose are. Therefore, I want, if you will be patient with me, to set the stage for the treaty, to let you see just what it was that was meant to be accomplished and just what it was that was accomplished.

Perhaps I can illustrate best by recalling some history. Something over a hundred years ago the last so-called peace conference sat in Vienna—back in the far year 1815, if I remember correctly. It was made up, as the recent conference in Paris was, of the leading statesmen of Europe. America was not then drawn into that general family and was not represented at that conference, and practically every Government represented at Vienna at that time, except the Government of Great Britain, was a Government like the recent Government of Germany, where a small coterie of autocrats were able to determine the fortunes of their people without consulting them, were able to use their people as puppets and pawns in the game of ambition which was being played all over the stage of Europe. But just before that conference there had been many signs that there was a breaking up of that old order, there had

been some very ominous signs, indeed. It was not then so long ago that, though there were but 3,000,000 people subject to the Crown of Great Britain in America, they had thrown off allegiance to that Crown successfully and defied the power of the British Empire on the ground that nobody at a distance had a right to govern them and that nobody had a right to govern them whom they did not choose to be their government; founding their government upon the principle that all just government rests upon the consent of the governed. And there had followed, as you remember, that whirlwind of passion that we know as the French Revolution, when all the foundations of French government not only, but of French society, had been shaken and disturbed—a great rebellion of a great suffering population against an intolerable authority that had laid all the taxes on the poor and none of them on the rich, that had used the people as servants, that had made the boys and men of France play upon the battle field as if they were chessmen upon a board. France revolted and then the spirit spread, and the conference of Vienna was intended to check the revolutionary spirit of the time. Those men met in order to concert methods by which they could make monarchs and monarchies safe, not only in Europe but throughout the world.

The British representatives at that conference were alarmed because they heard it whispered that European governments, European monarchies, particularly those of the center of Europe, those of Austria and Germany—for Austria was then stronger than Germany—were purposing to extend their power to the Western Hemisphere, to the Americas, and the prime minister of Great Britain suggested to Mr. Rush, the minister of the United States at the Court of Great Britain, that he put it in the ear of Mr. Monroe, who was then President, that this thing was afoot and it might be profitable to say something about it. Thereupon, Mr. Monroe uttered his famous Monroe Doc-

trine, saying that any European power that sought either to colonize this Western Hemisphere or to interfere with its political institutions, or to extend monarchical institutions to it, would be regarded as having done an unfriendly act to the United States, and since then no power has dared interfere with the self-determination of the Americas. That is the famous Monroe Doctrine. We love it, because it was the first effective dam built up against the tide of autocratic power. The men who constituted the congress of Vienna, while they thought they were building of adamant, were building of cardboard. What they threw up looked like battlements, but presently were blown down by the very breath of insurgent people, for all over Europe during the middle of the last century there spread, spread irresistibly, the spirit of revolution. Government after government was changed in its character; people said, "It is not only in America that men want to govern themselves, it is not only in France that men mean to throw off this intolerable yoke. All men are of the same temper and of the same make and same rights." So the time of revolution could not be stopped by the conclusions of the Congress of Vienna; until it came about, my fellow citizens, that there was only one stronghold left for that sort of power, and that was at Berlin. In the year 1914 that power sought to make reconquest of Europe and the world. It was nothing less than the reassertion of that old, ugly thing which the hearts of men everywhere always revolt against, the claim of a few men to determine the fortunes of all men, the ambition of little groups of rulers to dominate the world, the plots and intrigues of military staffs and men who did not confide in their fellow citizens what it was that was their ultimate purpose. So the fire burned in Europe, until it spread and spread like a great forest conflagration, and every free nation was at last aroused; saw the danger, saw the fearful sparks blowing over, carried by the winds of passion and likely to lodge in their

own dear countries and destroy their own fair homes; and at last the chief champion and spokesman of liberty, beloved America, got into the war, and said, "We see the dark plot now. We promised at our birth to be the champions of humanity and we have never made a promise yet that we will not redeem." I know how the tides of war were going when our men began to get over there in force, and I think it is nothing less than true to say that America saved the world.

Then a new congress of peace met to complete the work that the congress of Vienna tried to stop and resist. At the very front of this treaty of peace, my fellow citizens, is the covenant of the League of Nations, and at the heart of that lies this principle, that no nation shall be a member of that League which is not a self-governing and free nation; that no autocratic power may have any part in the partnership; that no power like Germany—such as Germany was—shall ever take part in its counsels. Germany has changed her constitution, as you know—has made it a democratic constitution, at any rate in form—and she is excluded for the time being from the League of Nations only in order that she may go through a period of probation to show that she means what she professes; to demonstrate that she actually does intend permanently to alter the character of her constitution and put into the hands of her people what was once concentrated as authority in Wilhelmstrasse in Berlin. If she can prove her change of heart and the permanency of her change of institutions, then she can come into respectable society; but if she can not, she is excluded forever. At last the cycle is completed, and the free people who were resisted at Vienna have come into their own. There was not a single statesman at Paris who did not know that he was the servant, and not the master, of his people. There was not one of them who did not know that the whole spiit of the times had changed and that they were there to see that people were liberated,

not dominated; that people were put in charge of their own territories and their own affairs. The chief business of the congress was to carry out that great purpose, and at last, in the covenant of the League of Nations, the Monroe Doctrine became the doctrine of the world. Not only may no European power impair the territorial integrity or interfere with the political independence of any state in the Americas but no power anywhere may impair the territorial integrity or invade the political independence of another power. The principle that Mr. Canning suggested to Mr. Monroe has now been vindicated by its adoption by the representative of mankind.

When I hear gentlemen ask the question, "Is the Monroe Doctrine sufficiently safeguarded in the covenant of the League of Nations?" I can only say that it is, if I understand the English language. It says in plain English that nothing in that covenant shall be interpreted as affecting the validity of the Monroe Doctrine. Could anything be plainer than that? And when you add to that that the principle of the Monroe Doctrine is applied to the whole world, then surely I am at liberty to say that the heart of the document is the Monroe Doctrine itself. We have at last vindicated the policy of America, because all through that treaty, and you will presently see all through the Austrian treaty, all through the Bulgarian treaty, all through the Turkish treaty, all through the separate treaty we must make with Hungary, because she is separated from Austria, runs the same principle, not only that no Government can impose its sovereignty on unwilling people, but that Governments which have imposed their sovereignty upon unwilling people must withdraw it. All the regions that were unwillingly subject to Germany, subject to Austria-Hungary, and subject to Turkey are now released from that sovereignty, and the principle is everywhere adopted that territories belong to the people that live on them, and that they can set up any sort of government

they please, and that nobody dare interfere with their self-determination and autonomy. I conceive this to be the greatest charter—nay, it is the first charter—ever adopted of human liberty. It sets the world free everywhere from autocracy, from imposed authority, from authority not chosen and accepted by the people who obey it.

By the same token it removes the grounds of ambition. My fellow citizens, we never undertake anything that we do not see through. This treaty was not written, essentially speaking, at Paris. It was written at Chateau-Thierry and in Belleau Wood and in the Argonne. Our men did not fight over there for the purpose of coming back and letting the same thing happen again. They did not come back with any fear in their heart that their public men would go back on them and not see the thing through. They went over there expecting that the business would be finished, and it shall be finished. Nothing of that sort shall happen again, because America is going to see it through, and what she is going to see through is this, what is contained in Article X of the covenant of the League. Article X is the heart of the enterprise. Article X is the test of the honor and courage and endurance of the world. Article X says that every member of the League, and that means every great fighting power in the world, Germany for the time being not being a great fighting power, solemnly engages to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of the other members of the League. If you do that, you have absolutely stopped ambitious and aggressive war. There is one thing you have not stopped, and that I for my part do not desire to stop, and I think I am authorized to speak for a great many of my colleagues, if not all of my colleagues at Paris, that they do not wish to stop it. It does not stop the right of revolution. It does not stop the choice of self-determination. No nation promises to protect any Government

against the wishes and actions of its own people or of any portion of its own people. Why, how could America join in a promise like that? She threw off the yoke of a Government. Shall we prevent any other people from throwing off the yoke that they are unwilling to bear? She never will, and no other Government ever will, under this covenant. But as against external aggression, as against ambition, as against the desire to dominate from without, we all stand together in a common pledge, and that pledge is essential to the peace of the world.

I said that our people were trained to go only one way, that our soldiers were trained to go only one way, and that America will never turn about upon the path of emancipation upon which she has set out. Not once, but several times, German orders were picked up, or discovered during the fighting, the purport of which was to certain commanders, "Do not let the Americans capture such and such a post, because if they ever get there you can never get them out." They had got other troops out, temporarily at any rate, but they could not get the Americans out. The Americans were under the impression that they had come there to stay, and I am under that impression about American political purposes. I am under the impression that we have come to the place where we have got in order to stay, and that some gentlemen are going to find that no matter how anxious they are to know that the door is open and that they can get out any time they want to they will be allowed to get out by themselves. We are going to stay in. We are going to see this thing finished, because my fellow citizens, that is the only possibility of peace; and the world not only desires peace but it must have it. Are our affairs entirely in order? Isn't the rest of the world aflame? Have you any conception of the recklessness, of the insubordinate recklessness, of the great population of Europe and of great portions of Asia? Do you suppose that these people are going to resume any sort of normal

life unless their rulers can give them adequate and ample guaranty of the future? And do you realize—I wonder if America does realize—that the rest of the world deems America indispensable to the guaranty? For a reason of which we ought to be very proud. They see that America has no designs on any other country in the world. They keep in mind—they keep in mind more than you realize—what happened at the end of the Spanish-American War. There were many cynical smiles on the other side of the water when we said that we were going to liberate Cuba and then let her have charge of her own affairs. They said, "Ah, that is a very common subterfuge. Just watch. America is not going to let that rich island, with its great sugar plantations and its undeveloped agricultural wealth, get out of its grip again." And all Europe stood at amaze when, without delay or hesitation, we redeemed our promise and gave Cuba the liberty we had won for her. They know that we have not imperialistic purposes.

In order to reassure you about some of the things about which you have been diligently misinformed, I want to speak of one or two details. I have set the stage now, and I have not half described the treaty. It not only fulfills the hopes of mankind by giving territories to the people that belong to them and assuring them that nobody shall take it from them, but it goes into many details. It rearranges, for example, the great waterways of Europe, so that no one nation can control them, so that the currents of European life through the currents of its commerce may run free and unhampered and undominated. It embodies a great charter for labour by setting up a permanent international organization in connection with the League of Nations which shall periodically bring the best counsels of the world to bear upon the problem of raising the levels and conditions of labour for men, women, and children. It goes further than that. We did not give Germany back her colonies, but we did not give them to anybody else.

We put them in trust in the League of Nations, said that we would assign their government to certain powers by assigning the powers as trustees, responsible to the League, making annual report to the League and holding the power under mandates which prescribe the methods by which they should administer those territories for the benefit of the people living in them, whether they were developed or undeveloped people. We have put the same safeguards, and as adequate safeguards, around the poor, naked fellows in the jungles of Africa that we have around those peoples almost ready to assume the rights of self-government in some parts of the Turkish Empire, as, for example, in Armenia. It is a great charter of liberty and of safety, but let me come to one or two details.

It sticks in the craw of a great many persons that in the constitution of the League of Nations, as it is said, Great Britain has been given six votes and the United States only one. That would be very interesting if true, but it does not happen to be true; that is to say, it is not true in this sense, that the one American vote counts as much as the British six. In the first place, they have not got six votes in the council of the League, which is the only body that originates action, but in the assembly of the League, which is the debating and not the voting body. Every time the assembly participates in any active resolution of the League that resolution must be concurred in by all the nations represented on the council, which makes the affirmative vote of the United States in every instance necessary. The six votes of the British Empire can not do anything to which the United States does not consent. Now—I am mistaken—there is one thing they can do. By a two-thirds vote they can admit new members to the League, but I do not think that is a formidable privilege since almost everybody is going to be in the League to begin with, and since the only large power that is not in the League enjoys, if I may use that word, a universal preju-

dice against it, which makes its early admission, at least, unlikely. But aside from admission of any members, which requires a two-thirds vote—in which the six British votes will not count a very large figure—every affirmative vote that leads to action requires the assent of the United States, and, as I have frequently said, I think it is very much more important to be one and count six than to be six and count six. So much for this bugaboo, for it is nothing else but a bugaboo. Bugaboos have been very much in fashion in the debates of those who have been opposing this League. The whole energy of that body is in the council of the League, for whose every action in the way of formulating policy or directing energetic measures a unanimous vote is necessary. That may sometimes, I am afraid, impede the action of the League; but, at any rate, it makes the sovereignty and the sovereign choice of every nation that is a member of that League absolutely safe. And pray do not deceive yourselves. The United States is not the only Government that is jealous of its sovereignty. Every other Government, big or little or middle sized, and that had to be dealt with in Paris, was just as jealous of its sovereignty as the United States. The only difference between some of them and us is that we could take care of our sovereignty and they could not take care of theirs, but it has been a matter of principle with the United States to maintain that in respect of rights there was and should be no difference between a weak state and a strong state. Our contention has always been, in international affairs, that we should deal with them upon the principle of the absolute equality of independent sovereignty, and that is the basis of the organization of the League. Human society has not moved fast enough yet or far enough yet, my fellow citizens, for any part of that principle of sovereignty to be relinquished, by any one of the chief participants at any rate.

Then there is another matter, that lies outside the

League of Nations, that I find my fellow citizens, in this part of the continent particularly, are deeply interested in. That is the matter of the cession of certain German rights in Shantung Province in China to Japan. I think that it is worth while to make that matter pretty clear, and I will have to ask you to be patient while I make a brief historical review in order to make it clear. In the first place, remember that it does not take anything from China, it takes it from Germany, and I do not find that there is any very great jealousy about taking things from Germany. In 1898 China granted to Germany for a period of ninety-nine years certain important rights around Kiaochow Bay, in the rich and ancient Province of Shantung, together with the right to penetrate the interior with a railway and exploit such ores as might be found in that Province for thirty miles on either side of the railway. We are thinking so much about that concession to Germany that we have forgotten that practically all of the great European powers had exacted similar concessions of China previously; they already had their foothold of control in China; they already had their control of railways; they already had their exclusive concessions over mines. Germany was doing an outrageous thing, I take the liberty of saying, as the others had done outrageous things, but it was not the first; at least, it had been done before. China lay rich and undeveloped and the rest of the world was covetous and it had made bargains with China, generally to China's disadvantage, which enabled the world to go in and exploit her riches. I am not now going to discuss the merits of that question, because it has no merits. The whole thing was bad, but it was not unprecedented. Germany obliged China to give her what China had given others previously. Immediately thereafter China was obliged, because she had done this thing, to make fresh concessions to Great Britain of a similar sort, to make fresh concessions to France, to make concessions of a similar kind to Russia.

It was then that she gave Russia Port Arthur and Ta-lien-wan.

Now, remember what followed. The Government of the United States did not make any kind of protest against any of those cessions. We had at that time one of the most public-spirited and humane men in the Executive Chair at Washington that have ever graced that chair—I mean William McKinley—and his Secretary of State was a man whom we have all always delighted to praise, Mr. John Hay. But they made no protest against the cession to Germany, or to Russia, or to Great Britain, or to France. The only thing they insisted on was that none of those powers should close the door of commerce to the goods of the United States in those territories which they were taking from China. They took no interest, I mean so far as what they did was concerned, in the liberties and rights of China. They were interested only in the rights of the merchants of the United States. I want to hasten to add that I do not say this even to imply criticism on those gentlemen, because as international law stood then it would have been an unfriendly act for them to protest in any one of these cases. Until this treaty was written in Paris it was not even proposed that it should be the privilege of anybody to protest in any such case if his own rights were not directly affected. Then, some time after that, followed the war between Russia and Japan. You remember where that war was brought to a close—by delegates of the two powers sitting at Portsmouth, N. H., at the invitation of Mr. Roosevelt, who was then President. In that treaty, Port Arthur—China's Port Arthur, ceded to Russia—was ceded to Japan, and the Government of the United States, though the discussions were occurring on its own territory, made no suggestion even to the contrary. Now, the treaty in Paris does the same thing with regard to the German rights in China. It cedes them to the victorious power, I mean to the power that took them by force of arms, the power

which was in the Pacific victorious in this war, namely, to Japan, and there is no precedent which would warrant our making a protest. Not only that, but, in the meantime, since this war began, Great Britain and France entered into solemn covenants of treaty with Japan that if she would come into the war and continue her operations against Germany in the Pacific they would lend their whole influence and power to the cession to Japan of everything that Germany had in the Pacific, whether on the mainland or in the islands, north of the Equator, so that if we were to reject this provision in the treaty Great Britain and France would not in honor be at liberty to reject it, and we would have to devise means to do what, let me say with all solemnity only war could do, force them to break their promise to Japan.

Well, you say, 'Then, is it just all an ugly, hopeless business?" It is not, if we adopt the League of Nations. The Government of the United States was not bound by these treaties. The Government of the United States was at liberty to get anything out of the bad business that it could get by persuasion and argument, and it was upon the instance of the Government of the United States that Japan promised to return to China what none of these other powers has yet promised to return—all rights of sovereignty that China had granted Germany over any portion of the Province of Shantung—the greatest concession in that matter that has ever been made by any power that has interested itself in the exploits of China—and to retain only what corporations out of many countries have long enjoyed in China, the right to run the railroad and extend its line to certain points and to continue to work the mines that have already been opened. Not only that, but I said a minute ago that Mr. Hay and Mr. McKinley were not at liberty to protest. Turn to the League of Nations and see what will be the situation then. Japan is a member of the League of Nations, all these other

powers that have exploited China are members, and they solemnly promise to respect and preserve the territorial integrity and existing political independence of China. Not only that, but in the next article the international law of the world is revolutionized. It is there provided that it is the friendly right of any member of the League at any time to call attention to anything anywhere that is likely to disturb the peace of the world or the good understanding between nations upon which the peace of the world depends. If we had had the covenant at that time, Mr. McKinley could, and I venture to say would, have said to Germany, "This is directly none of our business, for we are seeking no competitive enterprise of that sort in China, but this is an invasion of the territorial integrity of China. We have promised, and you have promised, to preserve and respect that integrity, and if you do not keep that promise it will destroy the good understanding which exists between the peaceful nations of the world. It will be an invasion, a violation of the essential principle of peace and of justice." Do you suppose for one moment that if the matter had been put in that aspect, with the attention of the world called to it by the great power of the United States, Germany would have persisted in that enterprise?

How had she begun it? She had made the excuse of the death of two German missionaries at the hands of irresponsible mobs in certain Provinces of China an excuse for taking this valuable part of China's territory. Ah, my fellow citizens, it makes anybody who regards himself as a Christian blush to think what Christian nations have done in the name of protecting Christianity! But it can not be done any more under the League of Nations. It can not be done without being cited to the bar of mankind, and if Germany had been cited to the bar of mankind before she began her recent tragical enterprise she never would have undertaken it. You can not expose such matters to the cool discussion of the world without disclosing

all their ugliness, their illegitimacy, their brutality. This treaty sets up, puts in operation, so to say, puts into commission the moral force of the world. Our choice with regard to Shantung, therefore, is to keep out of the treaty, for we can not change it in that respect, or go in and be an effective friend of China. I for one am ready to do anything or to cooperate in anything in my power to be a friend, and a helpful friend, to that great, thoughtful, ancient, interesting, helpless people — in capacity, in imagination, in industry, in numbers one of the greatest peoples in the world and entitled to the wealth that lies underneath their feet and all about them in that land which they have not as yet known how to bring to its development.

There are other things that have troubled the opponents of the League. One thing is they want to be sure they can get out. That does not interest me very much. If I go into a thing, my first thought is not how I can get out. My first thought is not how I can scuttle, but how I can help, how I can be effective in the game, how I can make the influence of America tell for the guidance and salvation of the world—not how I can keep out of trouble. I want to get into any kind of trouble that will help liberate mankind. I do not want always to be thinking about my skin or my pocketbook or my friendships. Is it just as comfortable to die quietly in your bed, never having done anything worth anything, as to die as some of those fellows that we shall always love when we remember them died upon the field of freedom? Is there any choice? Do you think anybody outside the family is going to be interested in any souvenir of you after you are dead? They are going to be interested in souvenirs of the boys in khaki, whether they are of their family or not. They are going to touch with reverence any sword or musket or rapid-fire gun or cannon that was fired for liberty upon the fields of France. I am not thinking of sitting by the door and keep-

ing my hand on the knob, but if you want to do that you can get out any time you want to. There is absolutely nothing in the covenant to prevent you. I was present at its formulation, and I know what I am talking about, besides being able to understand the English language. It not only meant this, but said it, that any nation can, upon two years' notice, withdraw at any time, provided that at the time it withdraws it has fulfilled its international obligations and its obligations under the covenant, but it does not make anybody judge as to whether it has fulfilled those obligations, except the nation that withdraws.

The only thing that can ever keep you in the League is being ashamed to get out. You can get out whenever you want to after two years' notice, and the only risk you run is having the rest of the world think you ought not to have got out. I, for my part, am not very sensitive about that, because I have a memory. I have read the history of the United States. We are in the habit of keeping our international obligations, and I do not believe that there will ever come a time when any just question can be raised as to whether we have fulfilled them or not. Therefore, I am not afraid to go before the jury of mankind at any time on the record of the United States with regard to the fulfillment of its international obligations; and when these gentlemen who are criticizing it once feel, if they ever should feel, the impulse of courage instead of the impulse of cowardice, they will realize how much better it feels. Your blood is at least warm and comfortable, and the red corpuscles are in command, when you have got some spunk in you; but when you have not, when you are afraid somebody is going to put over something on you, you are furtive and go about looking out for things, and your blood is cold and you shiver when you turn a dark corner. That is not a picture of the United States. When I think of these great frontier communities, I fancy I can hear the confident tread, tread, tread of the great hosts that crossed

this continent. They were not afraid of what they were going to find in the next canyon. They were not looking over their shoulders to see if the trail was clear behind them. They were making a trail of them and they had not the least notion of going back.

What I have come to suggest to you, my fellow citizens, is that you do what I am sure all the rest of our fellow countrymen are doing—clear the deck of these criticisms, that really have nothing in them, and look at the thing in its large aspect, in its majesty. Particularly, look at it as a fulfillment of the destiny of the United States, for it is nothing less. At last, after this long century and more of blood and terror, the world has come to the vision that that little body of 3,000,000 people, strung along the Atlantic coast of this continent, had in that far year 1776. Men in Europe laughed at them, at this little handful of dreamers, this little body of men who talked dogmatically about liberty, and since then that fire which they started on that little coast has consumed every autocratic government in the world, every civilized autocratic government, and now at last the flame has leaped to Berlin, and there is the funeral pyre of the German Empire.

ADDRESS AT TABERNACLE, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

SEPTEMBER 23, 1919

Governor Bamberger, President Grant, My Fellow Countrymen:

It is indeed inspiring to stand before this great audience, and yet I feel that I have come to present a theme which deserves the greatest of all audiences. I must admit to a very considerable degree of unaffected diffidence in presenting this theme, because the theme is so much bigger than any man's capacity to present it adequately. It is a

theme which must engage the enthusiastic support of every lover of humanity and every man who professes Christian conviction, because we are now as a nation to make what I can not help characterizing as the most critical decision we have ever made in the history of America. We sent our boys across the sea to defeat the purposes of Germany, but we engaged that after we had defeated the purposes of Germany we would complete what they had begun and effect such arrangements of international concert as would make it impossible for any such attempt ever to be made again. The question therefore is, Shall we see it through or shall we now at this most critical juncture of the whole transaction turn away from our associates in the war and decline to complete and fulfill our sacred promise to mankind?

I have now crossed the continent, my fellow countrymen, and am on my way East again, and I feel qualified to render testimony as to the attitude of this great nation toward the covenant of the League. I say without the slightest hesitation that an overwhelming majority of our fellow countrymen purpose that this covenant shall be adopted. One by one the objections to it have melted away. One by one it has become evident that the objections urged against it were without sufficient foundation. One by one it has become impossible to support them as objections, and at last we come to the point of critical choice as to the very heart of the whole matter.

You know it troubled some of our public men because they were afraid it was not perfectly clear that we could withdraw from this arrangement whenever we wanted to. There is no justification for doubt in any part of the language of the covenant on that point. The United States is at liberty to withdraw at any time upon two years' notice, the only restriction being that when it withdraws it shall have fulfilled its international obligations and its obligations under the covenant of the League, but it is left to its own conscience and to no other tribunal whatever to

determine whether those obligations have been fulfilled or not. I, for one, am not afraid of the judgment of mankind with regard to matters of this sort. The United States never has failed to fulfill its international obligations. It never will fail, and I am ready to go to the great jury of humanity upon that matter at any time that within our judgment we should withdraw from this arrangement. But I am not one of those who when they go into a great enterprise think first of how they are going to get out of it. I think first of how I am going to stay in it and how, with the power and influence I can command, I am going to promote the objects of the great concert and association which is being formed. And that is the temper of America.

The doubt as to whether some superior authority to our own Congress could intervene in matters of domestic policy is also removed. The language of the covenant expressly excludes the authorities of the League from taking any action or expressing any judgment with regard to domestic policies like immigration, like naturalization, like the tariff, like all of those things which have lain at the center so often of our political action and of our choice of policy.

Nobody doubts any longer that the covenant gives explicit, unqualified recognition to the Monroe Doctrine. Indeed, it does more than that. It adopts the principle of the Monroe Doctrine as the principle of the world. The principle of the Monroe Doctrine is that no nation has the right to interfere with the affairs or to impose its own will in any way upon another nation in the Western Hemisphere, and President Monroe said to the Governments of Europe, "Any attempt of that sort on the part of any Government of Europe will be regarded as an act unfriendly to the United States." The covenant of the League indorses that. The covenant of the League says that nothing in that document shall be construed as affecting the validity of the Monroe Doctrine, which means that if any power seeks to impose its will upon any American state in North

America, Central America, or South America, the world now acknowledges the right of the Government of the United States to take the initiative and check that action.

The forces of objection being driven out of one position after another are now centering upon the heart of the League itself. I have come here to-night, my fellow countrymen, to discuss that critical matter that you constantly see in the newspapers, which we call "reservations." I want you to have a very clear idea of what is meant by reservations. Reservations are to all intents and purposes equivalent to amendments. I can say, I believe with confidence, that it is the judgment of the people of the United States that neither the treaty nor the covenant should be amended. Very well, then; look at the character of the reservations. What does a reservation mean? It means a stipulation that this particular Government insists upon interpreting its duty under that covenant in a special way, insists upon interpreting it in a way in which other Governments, it may be, do not interpret it. This thing, when we ratify it, is a contract. You can not alter so much as the words of a contract without the consent of the other parties. Any reservation will have to be carried to all the other signatories, Germany included, and we shall have to get the consent of Germany, among the rest, to read this covenant in some special way in which we prefer to read it in the interest of the safety of America. That, to my mind, is one of the most unacceptable things that could happen. To my mind, to reopen the question of the meaning of this clearly written treaty is to reopen negotiations with Germany, and I do not believe that any part of the world is in the temper to do that. In order to put this matter in such a shape as will lend itself to concrete illustration, let me read you what I understand is a proposed form of reservation:

The United States assumes no obligation under the provisions of Article X to preserve the territorial integrity or political inde-

pendence of any other country or to interfere in controversies between other nations, whether members of the League or not, or to employ the military and naval forces of the United States under any article of the treaty for any purpose, unless in any particular case the Congress, which under the Constitution has the sole power to declare war or authorize the employment of the military and naval forces of the United States, shall by act or joint resolution so declare.

That is a rejection of the covenant. That is an absolute refusal to carry any part of the same responsibility that the other members of the League carry. Does the United States want to be in on that special footing? Does the United States want to say to the nations with whom it stood in his great struggle, "We have seen you through on the battle field, but now we are done. We are not going to stand by you?" Article X is an engagement on the part of all the great fighting nations of the world, because all the great fighting nations are going to be members of the League, that they will respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and the existing political independence of the other members of the League. That is cutting at the heart of all wars. Every war of any consequence that you can cite originated in an attempt to seize the territory or interfere with the political independence of some other nation. We went into this war with the sacred promise that we regarded all nations as having the same rights, whether they were weak or strong, and unless we engage to sustain the weak we have guaranteed that the strong will prevail, we have guaranteed that imperialistic enterprise may revive, we have guaranteed that there is no barrier to the ambition of nations that have the power to dominate, we have abdicated the whole position of right and substituted the principle of might. This is the heart of the covenant, and what are these gentlemen afraid of? Nothing can be done under that article of the treaty without the consent of the United States. I challenge them to draw any other deduction

from the provisions of the covenant itself. In every case where the League takes action the unanimous vote of the council of the League is necessary; the United States is a permanent member of the council of the League, and its affirmative vote is in every case necessary for every affirmative, or for that matter every negative, action.

Let us go into particulars. These gentlemen say, "We do not want the United States drawn into every little European squabble." Of course, we do not, and under the League of Nations it is entirely within our choice whether we will be or not. The normal processes of the action of the League are certainly to be this: When trouble arises in the Balkans, when somebody sets up a fire somewhere in central Europe among those little nations, which are for the time being looking upon one another with a good deal of jealousy and suspicion, because the passions of the world have not cooled—whenever that happens, the council of the League will confer as to the best methods of putting out the fire. If you want to put out a fire in Utah, you do not send to Oklahoma for the fire engine. If you want to put out a fire in the Balkans, if you want to stamp out the smoldering flame in some part of central Europe, you do not send to the United States for troops. The council of the League selects the powers which are most ready, most available, most suitable, and selects them only at their own consent, so that the United States would in no such circumstances conceivably be drawn in unless the flame spread to the world. And would they then be left out, even if they were not members of the League? You have seen the fire spread to the world once, and did not you go in? If you saw it spread again, if you saw human liberty again imperiled, would you wait to be a member of the League to go in?

My fellow citizens, the whole thing goes directly to the conscience of the nation. If the fight is big enough to draw the United States in, I predict that they will be

drawn in anyhow, and if it is not big enough to bring them in inevitably, they can go in or stay out according to their own decision. Why are these gentlemen afraid? There is no force to oblige the United States to do anything except moral force. Is any man, any proud American, afraid that the United States will resist the duress of duty? I am intensely conscious of the great conscience of this nation. I see the inevitableness, as well as the dignity and the greatness, of such declarations as President Grant has made aligning all the great organized moral forces of the world on the same side. It is inconceivable they should be on different sides.

There is no necessity for the last part of this reservation. Every public man, every statesman, in the world knows, and I say that advisedly, that in order that the United States should go to war it is necessary for the Congress to act. They do not have to be told that, but that is not what this resolution says. This resolution says the United States assumes no obligation under the provisions of Article X to preserve the territorial integrity or political independence of any other country—washes its hands of the whole business; says "We do not want even to create the presumption that we will do the right thing. We do not want to be committed even to a great principle, but we want to say that every time a case arises the Congress will independently take it up as if there were no covenant and determine whether there is any moral obligation; and after determining that, determining whether it will act upon that moral obligation or not, it will act." In other words, that is an absolute withdrawal from the obligations of Article X. That is why I say that it would be a rejection of the covenant and thereby a rejection of the treaty, for the treaty can not be executed without the covenant.

I appeal, and I appeal with confidence, my fellow countrymen, to the men whose judgment I am told has approved of reservations of this sort. I appeal to them to look into

the matter again. I know some of the gentlemen who are quoted as approving a reservation of that sort; I know them to be high-minded and patriotic Americans, and I know them to be men whose character and judgment I entirely respect, and whose motives I respect as much as I respect the motives of any man, but they have not looked into the matter. Are they willing to ask the rest of the world to go into this covenant and to let the United States assume none of is obligations? Let us have all the advantages of it and none of the responsibilities? Are they willing that proud America should ask for special exemptions, should show a special timidity, should ask to go into an arrangement depending upon a judgment when its own judgment is a different judgment? I confidently believe, my fellow citizens, that they will do no such thing. This is not an interpretation of the covenant. I have been trying to interpret it to you. This is a rejection of the covenant, and if this is adopted, the whole treaty falls to the ground, for, my fellow citizens, we must realize that a great and final choice is between this people. Either we are going to guarantee civilization or we are going to abandon it. I use the word with perhaps the admission that it may carry a slight exaggeration, but nevertheless advisedly, when I say abandon civilization, for what is the present condition of civilization? Everywhere, even in the United States, there is an attitude of antagonism toward the ordered processes of government. We feel the evil influence on this side of the Atlantic, and on the other side of the Atlantic every public man knows that it is knocking at the door of his Government.

While this unrest is assuming this menacing form of rebellion against authority, of determination to cut roads of force through the regular processes of government, the world is waiting on America, for—I say it with entire respect for the representatives of other governments, but I say it with knowledge—the Government of the United

States is the only government in the world that the rest of the world trusts. It knows that the Government of the United States speaks for the people of the United States, that it is not anybody's master, but the servant of a great people. It knows that that people can always oblige its governors to be its servants. It knows that nobody has ever dared defy the public judgment of the people of the United States, and it knows that that public judgment is on the side of right and justice and of peace. It has seen the United States do what no other nation ever did. When we fought the war with Spain there was many a cynical smile on the other side of the water when we said that we were going to win freedom for Cuba and then present it to her. They said, "Ah, yes; under the control of the United States. They will never let go of that rich island which they can exploit so much to their own advantage." When we kept that promise and proved our absolute disinterestedness, and, notwithstanding the fact that we had beaten Spain until she had to accept anything that we dictated, paid her $20,000,000 for something that we could have taken, namely, the Philippine Islands, all the world stood at amaze and said, "Is it true, after all, that this people believes and means what it says? Is it true, after all, that this is a great altruistic force in the world?"

And now look what has happened, my fellow citizens. Poland, Bohemia, the released parts of Roumania, Jugo-Slavia—there are kinsmen, I dare say, of these people in this audience—these could, none of them, have won their own independence any more than Cuba could have won hers, and they were under an authority just as reckless in the exercise of its force, just as regardless of the people and of humanity, as the Spanish Government ever was in Cuba and the Philippines; and by the force of the world these people have been liberated. Now the world is waiting to hear whether the United States will join in doing for them what it sanely did for Cuba, guaranteeing their freedom

and saying to them, "What we have given to you no man shall take away." It is our final heroic test of character, and I for one have not the slightest doubt as to what the result of the test is going to be, because I know that at heart this people loves freedom and right and justice more than it loves money and material prosperity or any of the things that anybody can get but nobody can keep unless they have elevation of spirit enough to see the horizons of the destiny of man.

Instead of wishing to ask to stand aside, get the benefits of the League, but share none of its burdens or responsibilities, I for my part want to go in and accept what is offered to us, the leadership of the world. A leadership of what sort, my fellow citizens? Not a leadership that leads men along the lines by which great nations can profit out of weak nations, not an exploiting power, but a liberating power, a power to show the world that when America was born it was indeed a finger pointed toward those lands into which men could deploy some of these days and live in happy freedom, look each other in the eyes as equals, see that no man was put upon, that no people were forced to accept authority which was not of their own choice, and that out of the general generous impulse of the human genius and the human spirit we were lifted along the levels of civilization to days when there should be wars no more, but men should govern themselves in peace and amity and quiet. That is the leadership we said we wanted, and now the world offers it to us. It is inconceivable that we should reject it. It is inconceivable that men should put any conditions upon accepting it, particularly—for I speak this with a certain hurt pride, by fellow citizens, as an American—particularly when we are so safeguarded that the world under the covenant can not do a thing that we do not consent to being done. Other nations, other governments, were just as jealous of their sovereignty as we have been, and this guarantees the sovereignty of all the equal

members of this great union of nations. There is only one nation for the time being excluded. That is Germany, and Germany is excluded only in order that she may go through a period of probation, only in order that she may prove to the world that she has made a real and permanent change in her constitution, and that hereafter, not Wilhelmstrasse but the votes of the German people will determine the policy of the German Government.

If I may say so without even by implication involving great public men whom I entirely respect, I want to say that the only popular forces back of serious reservations, the only popular forces back of the impulse to reject any part of this treaty, proceed from exactly the same sources that the pro-German propaganda proceeded from. I ask the honorable and enlightened men who I believe thoughtlessly favor reservations such as I have read to reflect upon that and examine into the truth of it, and to reflect upon this proposition: We, by holding off from this League, serve the purposes of Germany, for what Germany has sought throughout the war was, first, to prevent our going in, and, then, to separate us in interest and purpose from the other Governments with which we were associated. Now, shall we by the vote of the United States Senate do for Germany what she could not do with her arms? We shall be doing it, whether we intend it or not. I exculpate the men I am thinking of entirely from the purpose of doing it; it would be unworthy of me to suggest such a purpose, but I do suggest, I do state with confidence, that that is the only end that would be gained, because Germany is isolated from the other nations, and she desires nothing so much as that we should be isolated, because she knows that then the same kind of suspicion, the same kind of hostility, the same kind of unfriendliness—that subtle poison that brings every trouble that comes between nations—will center on the United States as well as upon Germany. Her isolation will be broken; she will have a

comrade, whether that nation wants to be her comrade or not, and what the lads did on the fields of France will be undone. We will allow Germany to do in 1919 what she failed to do in 1918!

It would be unworthy of me, my fellow citizens, in the responsible position into which you have put me, if I were to overstate any of these things. I have searched my conscience with regard to them. I believe I am telling you the sober truth, and I am telling you what I get, not by intuition, but through those many voices that inevitably reach the Government and do not always reach you from over sea. We know what the leading men of Germany are thinking and saying, and they are praying that the United States may stand off from the League. I call upon you, therefore, my fellow citizens, to look at this thing in a new aspect, to look upon it not with calculations of interest, not with fear of responsibility, but with a consciousness of the great moral issue which the United States must now decide and which, having decided, it can not reverse. If we keep out of this League now, we can never enter it except alongside of Germany. We can either go in now or come in later with our recent enemies, and to adopt a reservation such as I have read, which explicitly renounces responsibility under the central engagement of the covenant, is to do nothing less than that.

I hope that in order to strengthen this impression on your minds you will take pains to read the treaty of peace. You need not read all of it; a lot of it is technical and you can skip that; but I want you to get a picture of what is in this great document. It is much too narrow a view of it to think of it as a treaty of peace with Germany. It is that, but it is very much more than a treaty of peace with Germany; it is a treaty in which an attempt is made to set up the rights of peoples everywhere, for exactly the lines of this treaty are going to be projected—have been projected—into the treaty with Austria, into the treaty

with Bulgaria, into the treaty with Hungary, into the treaty with Turkey. Everywhere the same principle is adopted, that the men who wrote the treaties at Versailles were not at liberty to give anybody's property to anybody else. It is the first great international agreement in the history of civilization that was not based on the opposite principle. Every other great international arrangement has been a division of spoils, and this is an absolute renunciation of spoils, even with regard to the helpless parts of the world, even with regard to those poor benighted people in Africa, over whom Germany had exercised a selfish authority which exploited them and did not help them. Even they are not handed over to anybody else. The principle of annexation, the principle of extending sovereignty to territories that are not occupied by your own people, is rejected in this treaty. All of those regions are put under the trust of the League of Nations, to be administered for the benefit of their inhabitants—the greatest humane arrangement that has ever been attempted—and the rules are laid down in the covenant itself which forbid any form of selfish exploitation of these helpless people by the agents of the League who will exercise authority over them during the period of their development.

Then see how free course is given to our sympathies. I believe that there is no region of the world toward which the sympathies of the United States have gone out so abundantly as to the poor people of Armenia, those people infinitely terrified and infinitely persecuted. We have poured out money, we have sent agents of all sorts to relieve their distress, and at every turn we have known that every dollar we spent upon them might be rendered useless by the cruel power which had authority over them, that under pretense of not being able to control its own forces in those parts of the empire, the Turkish Government might say that it was unable to restrain the horrible massacres which have made that country a graveyard.

Armenia is one of the regions that are to be under trust of the League of Nations. Armenia is to be redeemed. The Turk is to be forbidden to exercise his authority there, and Christian people are not only to be allowed to aid Armenia but they are to be allowed to protect Armenia. At last this great people, struggling through night after night of terror, knowing not what day would see their land stained with blood, are now given a promise of safety, a promise of justice, a possibility that they may come out into a time when they can enjoy their own rights as free people, as they never dreamed they would be able to exercise them before. All of the great humane impulses of the human heart are expressed in this treaty, and we would be recreant to every humane obligation if we did not lend our whole force and, if necessary, make our utmost sacrifice to maintain its provisions. We are approaching the time in the discussions of the Senate when it will be determined what we are going to say about it, and I am here making this public appeal to you and, through you, to gentlemen who have favored such utterances as I have read to you to-night, to take a second thought upon the matter, to realize that what they are after is already accomplished. The United States can not be drawn into anything it does not wish to be drawn into, but the United States ought not to be itself in the position of saying, "You need not expect of us that we assume the same moral obligations that you assume. You need not expect of us that we will respect and preserve the territorial integrity and political independence of other nations."

Let me remove another misapprehension about the clause, my fellow citizens. Almost every time it is quoted the words "external aggression" are left out of it. There was not a member of that conference with whom I conferred who wanted to put the least restraint upon the right of self-determination by any portion of the human family, who wished to put the slightest obstacle in the way of

throwing off the yoke of any Government if that yoke should become intolerable. This does not guarantee any country, any Government, against an attempt on the part of its own subjects to throw off its authority. The United States could not keep its countenance and make a promise like that, because it began by doing that very thing. The glory of the United States is that when we were a little body of 3,000,000 people strung along the Atlantic coast we threw off the power of a great empire because it was not a power chosen by or consented to by ourselves. We hold that principle. We never will guarantee any Government against the exercise of that right, and no suggestion was made in the conference that we should. We merely ourselves promised to respect the territorial integrity and existing political independence of the other members of the League and to assist in preserving them against external aggression.

And if we do not do that the taproot of war is still sunk deep into the fertile soil of human passion. I am for cutting the taproot of war. I am for making an insurance against war, and I am prudent enough to take 10 per cent insurance if I can not get any more. I would be very pleased to get 25 per cent. I would be delighted to get 50 per cent, and here in conscience, I believe we are getting 99 per cent. No man, no body of men, can give you absolute 100 per cent insurance against war any more than they can give you 100 per cent insurance against losing your temper. You can not insure men against human passion, but notice what this covenant does: It provides nine months as a minimum for the cooling off of human passion. It is pretty hard to be crazy mad for nine months. If you stay crazy mad, or crazy anything else, for nine months, it will be wise to segregate you from your fellow citizens. The heart of this covenant, to which very few opponents ever draw attention, is this, that every great fighting nation in the world engages never

to go to war without first having done one or the other of two things, without having either submitted the point in controversy to arbitration, in which case it promises absolutely to abide by the verdict or submit it to the council of the League of Nations, not for decision but for discussion; it agrees to lay all the documents and all the pertinent facts before the council and agrees that the council shall publish the documents and the facts to mankind, that it will give six months to the council for the consideration of the matter, and that, even if it does not accept the result, it will not go to war for three months after the opinion is rendered. You have nine months in which to accomplish all the gentle work of mediation, all the same work of discussion, all the quieting work of a full comprehension of what the result of bringing the matter to the issue of war would be upon the nations immediately concerned and upon the nations of the world. And in Article XI, which follows Article X, it is made the right of any member of the League to call attention to anything, anywhere, which is likely to affect the peace of the world or the good understanding between nations upon which the peace of the world depends. So that, after the storm begins to gather, you can call the attention of the world to it, and the cleansing, purifying, cooling processes of public opinion will at once begin to operate.

I am not going to stop, my fellow citizens, to discuss the Shantung provision in all its aspects, but what I want to call your attention to is that just so soon as this covenant is ratified every nation in the world will have the right to speak out for China. And I want to say very frankly, and I ought to add that the representatives of those great nations themselves admit, that Great Britain and France and the other powers which have insisted upon similar concessions in China will be put in a position where they will have to reconsider them. This is the only way to serve and redeem China, unless, indeed, you want to start a war

for the purpose. At the beginning of the war and during the war Great Britain and France engaged by solemn treaty with Japan that if she would come into the war and continue in the war, she could have, provided she in the meantime took it by force of arms, what Germany had in China. Those are treaties already in force. They are not waiting for ratification. France and England can not withdraw from those obligations, and it will serve China not one iota if we should dissent from the Shantung arrangement; but by being parties to that arrangement we can insist upon the promise of Japan—the promise which the other governments have not matched—that she will return to China immediately all soverign rights within the Province of Shantung. We have got that for her now, and under the operations of Article XI and of Article X it will be impossible for any nation to make any further inroads either upon the territorial integrity or upon the political independence of China. I for one want to say that my heart goes out to that great people, that learned people, that accomplished people, that honest people, hundreds of millions strong but never adequately organized for the exercise of force, therefore always at the mercy of anyone who has effective armies or navies, always subject to be commanded, and never in a position unassisted by the world to insist upon its own rights.

It is a test—an acid test: Are you willing to go into the great adventure of liberating hundreds of millions of human beings from the threat of foreign power? If you are timid, I can assure you you can do it without shedding a drop of human blood. If you are squeamish about fighting, I will tell you you will not have to fight. The only force that outlasts all others and is finally triumphant is the moral judgment of mankind. Why is it that when a men tells a lie about you you do not wince, but when he tells the truth about you, if it is not creditable, then you wince? The only thing you are afraid of is the truth.

The only thing you dare not face is the truth. The only thing that will get you sooner or later, no matter how you sneak or dodge, is the truth; and the only thing that will conquer nations is the truth. No nation is going to look the calm judgment of mankind in the face for nine months and then go to war.

Address at Cheyenne, Wyo.

September 24, 1919

Governor Carey, My Fellow Countrymen:

It is with genuine satisfaction that I find myself in this great State, which I have only too seldom visited, and I appreciate this close contact with a body of its citizens in order that I may make clear some of the matters which have emerged in the discussion in the midst of which we now find ourselves. Governor Carey is quite right in saying that no document ever drew upon it more widespread discussion that the great treaty of peace with which your representatives returned from Paris. It is not to be wondered at, my fellow citizens, because that treaty is a unique document. It is the most remarkable document, I venture to say, in human history, because in it is recorded a complete reversal of the processes of government which had gone on throughout practically the whole history of mankind. The example that we set in 1776, which some statesmen in Europe affected to disregard and others presumed to ridicule, nevertheless set fires going in the hearts of men which no influence was able to quench, and one after another the Governments of the world have yielded to the influences of democracy. No man has been able to stay the tide, and there came a day when there was only one bulwark standing against it. That was in Berlin and Vienna—standing in the only territory which had not been conquered by the liberal forces of the opinion of the world,

continued to stand fast where there was planted a pair of Governments that could use their people as they pleased, as pawns and instruments in a game of ambition, send them to the battle field without condescending to explain to them why they were sent, send them to the battle field to work out a dominion over free peoples on the part of a Government that had never been liberalized and made free.

The world did not realize in 1914 that it had come to the final grapple of principle. It was only by slow degrees that we realized that we had any part in the war. We started the forces in 1776, as I have said, that made this war inevitable, but we were a long time realizing that, after all, that was what was at issue. We had been accustomed to regarding Europe as a field of intriguing, of rival ambitions, and of attempts to establish empire, and at first we merely got the impression that this was one of the usual European wars, to which, unhappily, mankind had become only too accustomed. You know how unwilling we were to go into it. I can speak for myself. I made every effort to keep this country out of the war, until it came to my conscience, as it came to yours, that after all it was our war as well as Europe's war, that the ambition of these central empires was directed against nothing less than the liberty of the world, and that if we were indeed, what we had always professed to be, champions of the liberty of the world, it was not within our choice to keep out of the great enterprise. We went in just in time. I can testify, my fellow countrymen, that the hope of Europe had sunk very low when the American troops began to throng overseas. I can testify that they had begun to fear that the terror would be realized and that the German power would be established. At first they were incredulous that our men could come in force enough to assist them. At first they thought that it was only a moral encouragement they would get from seeing that gallant emblem of the Stars and Stripes upon their fields. Presently they realized that

the tide was real, that here came men by the thousands, by the hundreds of thousands, by the millions; that there was no end to the force which would now be asserted to rescue the free peoples of the world from the terror of autocracy; and America had the infinite privilege of fulfilling her destiny and saving the world. I do not hesitate to say, as a sober interpretation of history, that American soldiers saved the liberties of the world.

I want to remind you of all this, my fellow citizens, because it is pertinent to the discussion that is now going on. We saved the liberties of the world, and we must stand by the liberties of the world. We can not draw back. You remember what happened in that fateful battle in which our men first took part. You remember how the French lines had been beaten and separated and broken at Chateau-Thierry, and you remember how the gates seemed open for the advancement of the Germans upon Paris. Then a body of men, a little body of men—American soldiers and American marines—against the protests of French officers, against the command of the remote commanders, nevertheless dared to fill that breach, stopped that advance, turned the Germans back, and never allowed them to turn their faces forward again. They were advised to go back, and they asked the naïve American question, "What did we come over here for? We did not come over here to go back; we came over here to go forward." And they never went in any other direction. The men who went to Chateau-Thierry, the men who went into Belleau Wood, the men who did what no other troops had been able to do in the Argonne, never thought of turning back, not only, but they never thought of making any reservations on their service. They never thought of saying, "We are going to do this much of the job and then scuttle and leave you to do the rest." I am here, I am on this journey, to help this nation, if I can by my counsel, to fulfill and complete the task which the men who died upon the battle

fields of France began, and I am not going to turn back any more than they did. I am going to keep my face just as they kept their face—forward toward the enemy.

My friends—I use the words advisedly—the only organized forces in this country, outside of Congressional Halls, against this treaty are the forces of hyphenated Americans. I beg you to observe that I say the only organized forces, because I would not include many individuals whom I know in any such characterization, but I do repeat that it is the pro-German forces and the other forces that showed their hyphen during the war that are now organized against this treaty. We can please nobody in America except these people by rejecting it or qualifying it in our acceptance of it. I want you to recall the circumstances of this Great War lest we forget. We must not forget to redeem absolutely and without qualification the promises of America in this great enterprise. I have crossed the continent now, my friends, and am a part of my way back. I can testify to the sentiment of the American people. It is unmistakable. The overwhelming majority of them demand the ratification of this treaty, and they demand it because, whether they have analyzed it or not, they have a consciousness of what it is that we are fighting for. We said that this was a people's war—I have explained to you that it was, though you did not need the explanation—and we said that it must be a people's peace. It is a people's peace. I challenge any man to find a contradiction to that statement in the terms of the great document with which I returned from Paris. It is so much of a people's peace that in every portion of its settlement every thought of aggrandizement, of territorial or political aggrandizement, on the part of the great powers was brushed aside, brushed aside by their own representatives. They declined to take the colonies of Germany in sovereignty, and said they would consent and demand that they be administered in trust by a concert of the nations through the instrumen-

tality of a League of Nations. They did not claim a single piece of territory. On the contrary, every territory that had been under the dominion of the Central Powers, unjustly and against its own consent, is by that treaty and the treaties which accompany it absolutely turned over in fee simple to the people who live in it. The principle is adopted without qualification upon which America was founded, that all just government proceeds from the consent of the governed. No nation that could be reached by the conclusions of this conference was obliged to accept the authority of a government by which it did not wish to be controlled. It is a peace of liberation. It is a peace in which the rights of peoples are realized, and when objection is made to the treaty, is any objection made to the substance of the treaty? There is only one thing in the substance of the treaty that has been debated seriously, and that is the arrangement by which Japan gets the rights that Germany had in Shantung Province in China. I wish I had time to go through the story of that fully. It was an unavoidable settlement, and nothing can be done for China without the League of Nations.

Perhaps you will bear with me if I take time to tell you what I am talking about. You know that China has been the common prey of the great European powers. Perhaps I should apologize to the representatives of those powers for using such a word, but I think they would admit that the word is justified. Nation after nation has demanded rights, semi-sovereign rights, and concessions with regard to mines and railways and every other resource that China could put at their disposition, and China has never been able to say "No"—a great learned, patient, diligent people, numbering hundreds of millions; has had no organized force with which to resist, and has yielded again and again and again to unjust demands. One of these demands was made upon her in March, 1898, by Germany—unjustly made. I will not go into the particulars, but I could jus-

tify that word "unjustly." A concession was demanded of her of the control of the whole district around Kiaochow Bay, one of the open doors to the trade and resources of China. She was obliged to yield to Germany practically sovereign control over that great region by the sea, and into the interior of the Province Germany was privileged to extend a railway and to exploit all the deposits of ore that might be found for thirty miles on either side of the railway which she was to build. The Government of the United States at that time, presided over by one of the most enlightened and beloved of our Presidents—I mean William McKinley—and the Department of State, guided by that able and high-minded man, John Hay, did not make the slightest protest. Why? Not because they would not if they could have aided China, but because under international law as it then stood no nation had the right to protest against anything that other nations did that did not directly affect its own rights. Mr. McKinley and Mr. Hay did insist that if Germany took control of Kiaochow Bay, she should not close those approaches to China against the trade of the United States. How pitiful, when you go into the court of right, you can not protect China, you can only protect your own merchandise! You can not say, "You have done a great wrong to these people." You have got to say, "We yield to the wrong, but we insist that you should admit our goods to be sold in those markets!" Pitiful, but nevertheless it was international law. All nations acted in that way at that time. Immediately following these concessions to Germany, Russia insisted upon concessions and got Port Arthur and other territories. England insisted, though she had had similar concessions in the past, upon an additional concession and got Wei-hai-wei. France came into the game and got a port and its territory lying behind it for the same period of time that Germany had got her concession, namely, ninety-nine years.

Then came the war between Russia and Japan, and what happened? In a treaty signed on our own sacred territory, at Portsmouth in New Hampshire, Japan was allowed to take from Russia what had belonged to China, the concession of Port Arthur and of Ta-lien-wan, the territory in that neighborhood. The treaty was written here; it was written under the auspices, so to say, of our own public opinion, but the Government of the United States was not at liberty to protest and did not protest; it acquiesced in the very thing which is being done in this treaty. What is being done in this treaty is not that Shantung is being taken from China. China did not have it. It is being taken from Germany, just as Port Arthur was not taken from China but taken from Russia and transferred to Japan. Before we got into the war, Great Britain and France had entered into solemn covenant by treaty with Japan that if she would take what Germany had in Shantung by force of arms, and also the islands lying north of the Equator which had been under German dominion in the Pacific, she could keep them when the peace came and its settlements were made. They were bound by a treaty of which we knew nothing, but which, notwithstanding our ignorance of it, bound them as much as any treaty binds. This war was fought to maintain the sacredness of treaties. Great Britain and France, therefore, can not consent to a change of the treaty in respect of the cession of Shantung, and we have no precedent in our history which permits us even to protest against it until we become members of the League of Nations.

I want this point to sink in, my fellow countrymen: The League of Nations changes the international law of the world with regard to matters of this sort. You have heard a great deal about Article X of the covenant of the League, and I will speak of it presently, but read Article XI, in conjunction with Article X. Every member of the League, in Article X, agrees never to impair the territorial integrity

of any other member of the League or to interfere with its existing political independence. Both of those things were done in all these concessions. There was a very serious impairment of the territorial integrity of China in every one of them, and a very serious interference with the political independence of that great but helpless Kingdom. Article X stops that for good and all. Then, in Article XI, it is provided that it shall be the friendly right of any member of the League at any time to call attention to anything anywhere that is likely to disturb the peace of the world or the good understanding between nations upon which the peace of the world depends, so that the ban would have been lifted from Mr. McKinley and Mr. Roosevelt in the matter of these things if we had the covenant of the League; they could have gone in and said, "Here is your promise to preserve the territorial integrity and political independence of this great people. We have the friendly right to protest. We have the right to call your attention to the fact that this will breed wars and not peace, and that you have not the right to do this thing." Henceforth, for the first time, we shall have the opportunity to play effective friends to the great people of China, and I for one feel my pulses quicken and my heart rejoice at such a prospect. We, a free people, have hitherto been dumb in the presence of the invasion of the freedom of other free peoples, and now restraint is taken away. I say it is taken away, for we will be members of the covenant. Restraint is taken away, and, like the men that we profess to be, we can speak out in the interest of free people everywhere.

But that is not all. America, as I have said, was not bound by the agreements of Great Britain and France, on the one hand, and Japan on the other. We were free to insist upon a prospect of a different settlement, and at the instance of the United States Japan has already promised that she will relinquish to China immediately after the

ratification of this treaty all the sovereign rights that Germany had in Shantung Province—the only promise of that kind ever made, the only relinquishment of that sort ever achieved—and that she will retain only what foreign corporations have all over China—unfortunately but as a matter of fact—the right to run the railroad and the right to work the mines under the usual conditions of Chinese sovereignty and as economic concessionaires, with no political rights or military power of any kind. It is really an emancipation of China, so far as that province is concerned, from what is imposed upon her by other nations in other provinces equally rich and equally important to the independence of China herself. So that inside the League of Nations we now have a foothold by which we can play the friend to China.

And the alternative? If you insist upon cutting out the Shantung arrangement, that merely severs us from the treaty. It does not give Shantung back to China. The only way you can give Shantung back to China is by arms in your hands, armed ships and armed men, sent against Japan and France and Great Britain. A fratricidal strife, in view of what we have gone through! We have just redeemed France. We can not with arms in our hands insist that France break a covenant, however ill judged, however unjust; we can not as her brothers in arms commit any such atrocious act against the fraternity of free people. So much for Shantung. Nobody can get that provision out of that treaty and do China any service whatever, and all such professions of friendship for China are empty noise, for the gentlemen who make those professions must know that what they propose will be not of the slightest service to her.

That is the only point of serious criticism with regard to the substance of the treaty. All the rest refers to the covenant of the League of Nations. With regard to that, my fellow citizens, I have this to say: Without the cove-

nant of the League of Nations that treaty can not be executed. Without the adherence of the United States to that covenant, the covenant can not be made effective. To state it another way, the maintenance of the peace of the world and the execution of the treaty depend upon the wholehearted participation of the people of the United States. I am not stating it as a matter of power. I am not stating it with the thought that the United States has greater material wealth and greater physical power than any other nation. The point that I want you to get is a very profound point; the point is that the United States is the only nation of the world that has sufficient moral force with the rest of the world. It is the only nation which has proved its disinterestedness. It is the only nation which is not suspected by the other nations of the world of ulterior purposes. There is not a Province in Europe in which American troops would not at this moment be welcomed with open arms, because the population would know that they had come as friends and would go so soon as their errand was fulfilled. I have had delegations come to me, delegations from countries where disorder made the presence of troops necessary, and beg me to order American troops there. They said, "We trust them; we want them. They are our friends." And all the world, provided we do not betray them by rejecting this treaty, will continue to regard us as their friends and follow us as their friends and serve us as their friends. It is the noblest opportunity ever offered to a great people, and we will not turn away from it.

We are coming now to the grapple, because one question at a time is being cleared away. We are presently going to have a show-down, a show-down on a very definite issue, and I want to bring your minds to that definite issue. A number of objections have been made to the covenant of the League of Nations, but they have been disposed of in candid minds. The first was the question whether we could

withdraw when we pleased. That is no longer a question in the mind of anybody who has studied the language and real meaning of the covenant. We can withdraw, upon two years' notice, when we please. I state that with absolutely no qualification. Then there was the question as to whether it interfered with self-determination; that is to say, whether there was anything in the guarantee of Article X about territorial integrity and political independence which would interfere with the assertion of the right of great populations anywhere to change their governments, to throw off the yoke of sovereignties which they did not desire to live under. There is absolutely no such restraint. I was present and can testify that when Article X was debated the most significant words in it were the words "against external aggression." We do not guarantee any government against anything that may happen within its own borders or within its own sovereignty. We merely say that we will not impair its territorial integrity or interfere with its political independence, and we will not countenance other nations outside of it making prey of it in the one way or the other. Every man who sat around that table, and at the table where the conference on the League of Nations sat there were fourteen free peoples represented, believed in the sacred right of self-determination, would not have dared to go back and face his own people if he had done or said anything that stood in the way of it. That is out of the way.

There is another matter in that connection I want to speak of. The constitution of the League of Nations is not often enough explained. It is made up of two bodies. One body, which is a comparatively large body, is called the assembly. The assembly is not an originative body. The assembly is, so to say, the court of the public opinion of the world. It is where you can broach questions, but not decide them. It is where you can debate anything that affects the peace of the world, but not determine upon a

course of action upon anything that affects the peace of the world. The whole direction of the action of the League is vested in another body known as the council, and nothing in the form of an active measure, no policy, no recommendation with regard to the action of the governments composing the League can proceed except upon a unanimous vote of the council. Mark you, a unanimous vote of the council. In brief, inasmuch as the United States of America is to be a permanent member of the council of the League, the League can take no step whatever without the consent of the United States of America. My fellow citizens, think of the significance of that in view of the debates you have been listening to. There is not a single active step that the League can take unless we vote aye. The whole matter is, in that negative sense, in the ability to stop any action, in our hands. I am sometimes inclined to think that that weakens the League, that it has not freedom of action enough, notwithstanding that I share with all of my fellow countrymen a very great jealousy with regard to setting up any power that could tell us to do anything, but no such power is set up. Whenever a question of any kind with regard to active policy—and there are only three or four of them—is referred to the assembly for its vote, its vote in the affirmative must include the representatives of all the nations which are represented on the council. In the assembly, as in the council, any single nation that is a member of the council has a veto upon active conclusions. That is my comment upon what you have been told about Great Britain having six votes and our having one. I am perfectly content with the arrangement, since our one offsets the British six. I do not want to be a repeater; if my one vote goes, I do not want to repeat it five times.

And is it not just that in this debating body, from which without the unanimous concurrence of the council no active proceeding can originate, that these votes should have been

given to the self-governing powers of the British Empire? I am ready to maintain that position. Is it not just that those stout little Republics out in the Pacific, of New Zealand and Australia, should be able to stand up in the councils of the world and say something? Do you not know how Australia has led the free peoples of the world in many matters that have led to social and industrial reform? It is one of the most enlightened communities in the world and absolutely free to choose its own way of life independent of the British authority, except in matters of foreign relationship. Do you not think that it is natural that that stout little body of men whom we so long watched with admiration in their contest with the British Crown in South Africa should have the right to stand up and talk before the world? They talked once with their arms, and, if I may judge by my contact with them, they can talk with their minds. They know what the interests of South Africa are, and they are independent in their control of the interests of South Africa. Two of the most impressive and influential men I met in Paris were representatives of South Africa, both of them members of the British peace delegation in Paris, and yet both of them generals who had made British generals take notice through many months of their power to fight—the men whom Great Britain had fought and beaten and felt obliged to hand over their own government to, and say, "It is yours and not ours." They were men who spoke counsel, who spoke frank counsel. And take our neighbor on the north—do you not think Canada is entitled to a speaking part? I have pointed out to you that her voting part is offset, but do you not think she is entitled to a speaking part? Do you not think that that fine dominion has been a very good neighbor? Do you not think she is a good deal more like the United States than she is like Great Britain? Do you not feel that probably you think alike? The only other vote given to the British Empire is given to that hitherto

voiceless mass of humanity that lives in that region of romance and pity that we know as India. I am willing that India should stand up in the councils of the world and say something. I am willing that speaking parts should be assigned to these self-governing, self-respecting, energetic portions of the great body of humanity.

I take leave to say that the deck is cleared of these bugaboos. We can get out if we want to. I am not interested in getting out. I am interested in getting on. But we can get out. The door is not locked. You can sit on the edge of your chair and scuttle any time you want to. There are so many who are interested first of all in knowing that they are not in for anything that can possibly impose anything on them. Well, we are not in for anything that we do not want to continue to carry. We can help in the matters of self-determination, as we never helped before. The six votes of the British Empire are offset by our own, if we choose to offset them. I dare say we shall often agree with them; but if we do not, they can not do anything that we do not consent to. The Monroe Doctrine is taken care of. There is no danger of interference with domestic questions.

Well, what remains? Nothing except Article X, and that is the heart of the whole covenant. Anybody who proposes to cut out Article X proposes to cut all the supports from under the peace and security of the world, and we must face the question in that light; we must draw the issue as sharply as that; we must see it through as distinctly as that. Let me repeat Article X. I do not know that I can do it literally, but I can come very near. Under Article X every member of the League engages to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of the other members of the League. That cuts at the taproot of war. The wars of the past have been leveled against the liberties of peoples and territories of those who could not defend

them, and if you do not cut at that taproot that upas tree is going to grow again; and I tell you my fellow countrymen, that if you do not cut it up now it will be harder to cut it up next time. The next time will come; it will come while this generation is living, and the children that crowd about our car as we move from station to station will be sacrificed upon the altar of that war. It will be the last war. Humanity will never suffer another, if humanity survives. My fellow countrymen, do you realize that at the end of the war that has just closed new instruments of destruction had been invented and were about to be used that exceeded in terrible force and destructive power any that had been used before in this war? You have heard with wonder of those great cannon from which the Germans sent shells seventy miles into Paris. Just before the war closed shells had been invented that could be made to steer themselves and carry immense bodies of explosives a hundred miles into the interior of countries, no matter how great the serried ranks of their soldiers were at the border. This war will be child's play as compared with another war. You have got to cut the root of that upas tree now or betray all future generations.

And we can not without our vote in council, even in support of Article X, be drawn into wars that we do not wish to be drawn into. The second sentence of Article X is that the council shall advise as to the method of fulfilling this guaranty, that the council which must vote by unanimous vote, must advise—can not direct—what is to be done for the maintenance of the honor of its members and for the maintenance of the peace of the world. Is there anything than can frighten a man or a woman or a child, with just thought or red blood, in those provisions? And yet listen. I understand that this reservation is under consideration. I ask your very attentive ear.

The United States assumes no obligation under the provisions of Article X to preserve the territorial integrity or political inde-

pendence of any other country or to interfere in controversies between other nations, whether members of the League or not, or to employ the military and naval forces of the United States under any article of the treaty for any purpose, unless in any particular case the Congress, which under the Constitution has the sole power to declare war or authorize the employment of the military and naval forces of the United States, shall by act or joint resolution so declare.

In other words, my fellow citizens, what this proposes is this: That we should make no general promise, but leave the nations associated with us to guess in each instance what we were going to consider ourselves bound to do and what we were not going to consider ourselves bound to do. It is as if you said, "We will not join the League definitely, but we will join it occasionally. We will not promise anything, but from time to time we may cooperate. We will not assume any obligations." Observe, my fellow citizens, as I have repeatedly said to you and can not say too often, the council of the League can not oblige us to take military action without the consent of Congress. There is no possibility of that. But this reservation proposes that we should not acknowledge any moral obligation in the matter; that we should stand off and say, "We will see, from time to time; consult us when you get into trouble, and then we will have a debate, and after two or three months we will tell you what we are going to do." The thing is unworthy and ridiculous, and I want to say distinctly that, as I read this, it would change the entire meaning of the treaty and exempt the United States from all responsibility for the preservation of peace. It means the rejection of the treaty, my fellow countrymen, nothing less. It means that the United States would take from under the structure its very foundations and support.

I happen to know that there are some men in favor of that reservation who do not in the least degree realize its meaning, men whom I greatly respect, men who have just as much ardor to carry out the promises of the United

States as I have, and I am not indicting their purpose, but I am calling their attention to the fact that if any such reservation as that should be adopted I would be obliged as the Executive of the United States to regard it as a rejection of the treaty. I ask them, therefore, to consider this matter very carefully, for I want you to realize, and I hope they realize, what the rejection of the treaty means —two isolated and suspected people, the people of Germany and the people of the United States. Germany is not admitted to respectable company yet. She is not permitted to enter the League until such time as she shall have proved to the satisfaction of the world that her change of government and change of heart is real and permanent. Then she can be admitted. Now, her dearest desire, feeling her isolation, knowing all the consequences that would result, economic and social, is to see the United States also cut off its association with the gallant peoples with whom side by side we fought this war. I am not making this statement by conjecture. We get it directly from the mouths of authoritative persons in Germany that their dearest hope is that America will now accomplish by the rejection of the treaty what Germany was not able to accomplish by her arms. She tried to separate us from the rest of the world. She tried to antagonize the rest of the world against the United States, and she failed so long as American armies were in the field. Shall she succeed now, when only American voters are in the field? The issue is final. We can not avoid it. We have got to make it now, and, once made, there can be no turning back. We either go in with the other free peoples of the world to guarantee the peace of the world now, or we stay out and on some dark and disastrous day we seek admission to the League of Nations along with Germany. The rejection of this treaty, my fellow citizens, means the necessity of negotiating a separate treaty with Germany. That separate treaty between Germany and the United States could not alter

any sentence of this treaty. It could not affect the validity of any sentence of this treaty. It would simply be the Government of the United States going, hat in hand, to the assembly at Weimar and saying, "May it please you, we have dissociated ourselves from those who were your enemies; we have come to you asking if you will consent to terms of amity and peace which will dissociate us, both of us, from the comradeship of arms and liberty." There is no other interpretation. There is no other issue. That is the issue, and every American must face it.

Address at Auditorium, Denver, Colo.

September 25, 1919

Mr. Chairman, My Fellow Countrymen:

I always feel a thrill of pride in standing before a great company of my fellow citizens to speak for this great document which we shall always know as the treaty of Versailles. I am proud to speak for it, because for the first time in the history of international consultation men have turned away from the ambitions of governments and have sought to advance the fortunes of peoples. They have turned away from all those older plans of domination and sought to lay anew the foundations for the liberty of mankind. I say without hesitation that this is a great document of liberation. It is a new charter for the liberty of men.

As we have advanced from week to week and from month to month in the debate of this great document, I think a great many things that we talked about at first have cleared away. A great many difficulties which were at first discovered, or which some fancied that they had discovered, have been removed. The center and heart of this document is that great instrument which is placed at the beginning of it, the covenant of the League of Nations. I think

everybody now understands that you can not work this treaty without that covenant. Everybody certainly understands that you have no insurance for the continuance of this settlement without the covenant of the League of Nations, and you will notice that, with the single exception of the provision with regard to the transfer of the German rights in Shantung in China to Japan, practically nothing in the body of the treaty has seemed to constitute any great obstacle to its adoption. All the controversy, all the talk, has centered on the League of Nations, and I am glad to see the issue center; I am glad to see the issue clearly drawn, for now we have to decide, Shall we stand by the settlements of liberty, or shall we not?

I want, just by way of introduction and clarification, to point out what is not often enough explained to audiences in this country, the actual constitution of the League of Nations. It is very simply constituted. It consists of two bodies, a council and an assembly. The assembly is the numerous body. In it every self-governing state that is a member of the League is represented, and not only the self-governing independent states, but the self-governing colonies and dominions, such as Canada, New Zealand, Australia, India, and South Africa, are all represented in the assembly. It is in the assembly that the combined representation of the several parts of the British Empire are assigned six votes, and you are constantly being told that Great Britain has six votes and we have one. I want you to appreciate the full significance of that. They have six votes in the assembly, and the assembly does not vote. That bubble is exploded. There are several matters in which the vote of the assembly must cooperate with the vote of the council, but in every such case an unanimous vote of the council is necessary, and, inasmuch as the United States is a permanent member of the council, her vote is necessary to every active policy of the League. Therefore the single vote of the United States always

counts six, so far as the votes of the British Empire are concerned, and if it is a mere question of pride, I would rather be one and count six than six and count six.

That affords emphasis to the point I wish you to keep distinctly in mind with regard to reservations and all the qualifications of ratification which are being discussed. No active policy can be undertaken by the League without the assenting vote of the United States. I can not understand the anxiety of some gentlemen for fear something is going to be put over on them. I can not understand why, having read the covenant of the League and examined its constitution, they are not satisfied with the fact that every active policy of the League must be concurred in by a unanimous vote of the council, which means that the affirmative vote of the United States is in every instance necessary.

What is the covenant for? To hear most of the debate, you would think that it was an ingenious contrivance for a subtle interference with the affairs of the United States. On the contrary, it is one of the most solemn covenants ever entered into by all the great fighting powers of the world that they never will resort to war again without first having either submitted the question at issue to arbitration and undertaken to abide by the verdict of the arbitrators or submitted it to discussion by the council of the League of Nations, laying all the documents, all the facts, before that council, consenting that that council should lay all those documents and all those facts before the world; they agree to allow six months for that discussion, and, even if they are not satisfied with the opinion, for it is only an opinion in that case, rendered by the council, they agree not to go to war for three months after the opinion has been rendered. There you have nine months' submission to the moral judgment of the world. In my judgment, that is an almost complete assurance against war. If any such covenant as that had existed in 1914, Germany never would

have gone to war. The one thing that Germany could not afford to do, and knew that she could not afford to do, was to submit her case to the public opinion of the world. We have now abundant proof of what would have happened, because it was the moral judgment of the world that combined the world against Germany. We were a long time, my fellow citizens, seeing that we belonged in the war, but just so soon as the real issues of it became apparent we knew that we belonged here. And we did an unprecedented thing. We threw the whole power of a great nation into a quarrel with the origination of which it had nothing to do. I think there is nothing that appeals to the imagination more in the history of men than those convoyed fleets crossing the ocean with millions of American soldiers aboard—those crusaders, those men who loved liberty enough to leave their homes and fight for it upon distant fields of battle, those men who swung out into the open as if in fulfillment of the long prophecy of American history. There is nothing finer in the records of public action than the united spirit of the American people behind this great enterprise.

I ask your close observation to current events, my fellow countrymen. Out of doors, that is to say, that out of legislative halls, there is no organized opposition to this treaty except among the people who tried to defeat the purpose of this Government in the war. Hyphens are the knives that are being stuck into this document. The issue is clearly drawn. Inasmuch as we are masters of our own participation in the action of the League of Nations, why do we need reservations? If we can not be obliged to do anything that we do not ourselves vote to do, why qualify our acceptance of a perfectly safe agreement? There can be only one object, my fellow citizens, and that is to give the United States a standing of exceptional advantage in the League, to exempt it from obligations which the other members assume, or to put a special interpretation upon

the duties of the United States under the covenant which interpretation is not applied to the duties of other members of the League under the covenant. I, for my part, say that it is unworthy of the United States to ask any special privilege of that kind. I am for going into a body of equals or staying out. That is the very principle we have been fighting for and have been proud to fight for, that the rights of a weak nation were just as sacred as the rights of a great nation. That is what this treaty was drawn to establish. You must not think of this treaty alone. The lines of it are being run out into the Austrian treaty and the Hungarian treaty and the Bulgarian treaty and the Turkish treaty, and in every one of them the principle is this, to deliver peoples who have been living under sovereignties that were alien and unwelcome from the bondage under which they have lived, to turn over to them their own territory, to adopt the American principle that all just government is derived from the consent of the governed. All down through the center of Europe and into the heart of Asia has gone this process of liberation, taking alien yokes off the necks of such peoples and vindicating the American principle that you can not impose upon anybody a sovereignty that is not of its own choice. And if the results of this great liberation are not guaranteed, then they will fall down like a house of cards. What was the program of Pan Germanism? You know the formula—from Bremen to Bagdad. Very well; that is the very stretch of country over which these people have been liberated. New states, one after another, have been set up by the action of the conference at Paris all along the route that was intended to be the route of German dominion, and if we now merely set them up and leave them in their weakness to take care of themselves, then Germans can at their leisure, by intriguing, by every subtle process of which they are master, accomplish what they could not accomplish by arms, and we will have abandoned the people

whom we redeemed. The thing is inconceivable. The thing is impossible.

We therefore have come to the straight-cut line—adoption or rejection. Qualified adoption is not adoption. It is perfectly legitimate, I admit, to say in what sense we understand certain articles. They are all perfectly obvious in meaning, so far as I can see, but if you want to make the obvious more obvious I do not see any objection to that; if by the multiplication of words you can make simple words speak their meaning more distinctly, I think that that is an interesting rhetorical exercise, but nothing more. Qualification means asking special exemptions and privileges for the United States. We can not ask that. We must either go in or stay out. Now, if we go in what do we get? I am not now confining my view to ourselves. America has shown the world that she does not stop to calculate the lower sort of advantage and disadvantage; that she goes in upon a high plane of principle, and is willing to serve mankind while she is serving herself. What we gain in this treaty is, first of all, the substitution of arbitration and discussion for war. If you got nothing else, it is worth the whole game to get that. My fellow citizens, we fought this war in order that there should not be another like it. I am under bonds, I am under bonds to my fellow citizens of every sort, and I am particularly under bonds to the mothers of this country and to the wives of this country and to the sweethearts that I will do everything in my power to see to it that their sons and husbands and sweethearts never have to make that supreme sacrifice again. And when I passed your beautiful Capitol Square just now and saw thousands of children there to greet me, I felt a lump in my throat. These are the little people that I am arguing for. These are my clients, these lads coming on and these girls that, staying at home, would suffer more than the lads who died on the battle field, for it is the tears at home that are more

bitter than the agony upon the field. I dare not turn away from the straight path I have set myself to redeem this promise that I have made.

Stop for a moment to think about the next war, if there should be one. I do not hesitate to say that the war we have just been through, though it was shot through with terror of every kind, is not to be compared with the war we would have to face next time. There were destructive gases, there were methods of explosive destruction unheard of even during this war, which were just ready for use when the war ended—great projectiles that guided themselves and shot into the heavens went for a hundred miles and more and then burst tons of explosives upon helpless cities, something to which the guns with which the Germans bombarded Paris from a distance were not comparable. What the Germans used were toys as compared with what would be used in the next war. Ask any soldier if he wants to go through a hell like that again. The soldiers know what the next war would be. They know what the inventions were that were just about to be used for the absolute destruction of mankind. I am for any kind of insurance against a barbaric reversal of civilization.

And by consequence, the adoption of the treaty means disarmament. Think of the economic burden and the restraint of liberty in the development of professional and mechanic life that resulted from the maintenance of great armies, not only in Germany but in France and in Italy and, to some extent, in Great Britain. If the United States should stand off from this thing we would have to have the biggest army in the world. There would be nobody else that cared for our fortunes. We would have to look out for ourselves, and when I hear gentlemen say, "Yes; that is what we want to do, we want to be independent and look out for ourselves," I say, "Well, then, consult your fellow citizens. There will have to be universal conscription. There will have to be taxes such as even yet we have not

seen. There will have to be a concentration of authority in the Government capable of using this terrible instrument. You can not conduct a war or command an army by a debating society. You can not determine in community centers what the command of the Commander-in-Chief is going to be; you will have to have a staff like the German staff, and you will have to center in the Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy the right to take instant action for the protection of the nation." America will never consent to any such thing.

Then, if we have this great treaty, we have what the world never had before—a court of public opinion of the world. I do not think that you can exaggerate the significance of that, my fellow countrymen. International law up to this time has been the most singular code of manners. You could not mention to any other Government anything that concerned it unless your could prove that your own interests were immediately involved. Unless you could prove that it was your own material interest that was involved, it was impolite to speak of it. There might be something brooding that threatened the peace of the world, and you could not speak of it unless the interests of the United States were involved. Under Article XI any member of the League can at any time call attention to anything, anywhere, which is likely to affect the peace of the world or the good understanding between nations upon which the peace of the world depends. The littlest nation, along with the biggest—Panama, to take one of our own near neighbors—can stand up and challenge the right of any nation in the world to do a thing which threatens the peace of the world. It does not have to be a big nation to do it.

The voice of the world is at last released. The conscience of the world is at last given a forum, and the rights of men not liberated under this treaty are given a place where they can be heard. If there are nations which wish to exercise the power of self-determination but are not liberated by

this treaty, they can come into that great forum, they can point out how their demands affect the peace and quiet of the world, they can point out how their demands affect the good understanding between nations. There is a forum here for the rights of mankind which was never before dreamed of, and in that forum any representative has the right to speak his full mind. If that is not a wholesome moral clearing house, I wish somebody would suggest a better. It is just a moral clearing house that the world needs. There have been a great many things unspoken that ought to have been spoken. There have been voiceless multitudes all over the world who had nobody to speak for them in any court of conscience anywhere, and now they are given spokesmen. All forward-looking men may now see their way to the method in which they may help forward the real processes of civilization.

There is another matter which I am sure will interest a great many in sound of my voice. If we do not have this treaty of peace, labour will continue to be regarded, not as it ought to be regarded, a human function, but as a purchasable commodity throughout the world. There is inserted in this great treaty a Magna Charta of labour. There is set up here a means of periodic examination of the conditions of labour all over the world, particularly the labour of women and children and those who have not the physical force to handle some of the burdens that are put upon them, and it is made the duty of the nations of the world constantly to study the methods of raising the levels of human labour. You know what that means. We have not done our full duty with regard to the amelioration and betterment of the conditions of labour in America, but the conditions here are better than they are anywhere else. We now have an opportunity to exercise our full influence to raise the levels everywhere to the levels which we have tried to maintain in this country, and then to take them higher into the fields of that sort of association between those who employ labour

and those who execute it as will make it a real human relationship and not a mere commercial relationship. The heart of the world has never got into this business yet. The conscience of the world has never been released along lines of action in regard to the improvement of the conditions of labour. And more than that, until we find such methods as I have been alluding to, we are never releasing the real energies of this people. Men are not going to work and produce what they would produce if they feel that they are not justly treated. If you want to realize the real wealth of this country, then bring about the human relationship between employers and employees which will make them colabourers and partners and fellow workers. All of that is open to us through the instrumentality of the League of Nations under this great treaty, and still we debate whether we should ratify it or not.

There is a great deal of pleasure in talking, I admit; and some men, even some men I do not agree with, I admit, talk very well, indeed. It is a pleasure to hear them when they are honest; it is a pleasure to be instructed by them when they know what they are talking about. But we have reached the stage now when all the hings that needed to be debated have been debated and all the doubts are cleared up. They are cleared up just as thoroughly as the English language can clear them. The people of the United States are no longer susceptible to being misled as to what is in this covenant, and they now have an exceedingly interesting choice to make. I have said it a great many times, my fellow countrymen, but I must say it again, because it is a pleasant thing to testify about, the fundamental thing that I discovered on the other side of the water was that all the great peoples of the world are looking to America for leadership. There can be no mistaking that. The evidences were too overwhelming, the evidences were too profoundly significant, because what underlay them was this: We are the only nation which so

far has not laid itself open to suspicion of ulterior motives. We are the only nation which has not made it evident that when we go to anybody's assistance we mean to stay there longer than we are welcome. Day after day I received delegations in Paris asking—what? Credits from the United States? No. Merchandise from the United States? Yes, if possible; but that was not the chief point. They were asking that I send American troops to take the place of other troops, because they said, "Our people will welcome them with open arms as friends who have come for their sakes and not for anything that America can possibly in the future have in mind." What an extraordinary tribute to the principles of the United States! What an extraordinary tribute to the sincerity of the people of the United States! I never was so proud in my life as when these evidences began to accumulate. I had been proud always of being an American, but I never before realized fully what it meant. It meant to stand at the front of the moral forces of the world.

My fellow citizens, I think we must come to sober and immediate conclusions. There is no turning aside from the straight line. We must now either accept this arrangement or reject it. If we accept it, there is no danger either to our safety or to our honor. If we reject it, we will meet with suspicion, with distrust, with dislike, with disillusionment everywhere in the world. This treaty has to be carried out. In order to carry this treaty out, it is necessary to reconstruct Europe economically and industrially. If we do not take part in that reconstruction, we will be shut out from it, and by consequence the markets of Europe will be shut to us. The combinations of European Governments can be formed to exclude us wherever it is possible to exclude us; and if you want to come to the hard and ugly basis of material interest, the United States will everywhere trade at an overwhelming disadvantage just so soon as we have forfeited, and deserve to forfeit, the

confidence of the world. I ask merchants, "Who are good customers, friends or enemies? Who are good customers, those who open their doors to you, or those who have made some private arrangement elsewhere which makes it impossible for them to trade with you?" I have heard Europe spoken of as bankrupt. There may be great difficulties in paying the public debts, but there are going to be no insuperable difficulties to rebeginning the economic and industrial life of Europe. The men are there, the materials are there, the energy is there, and the hope is there. The nations are not crushed. They are ready for the great enterprises of the future, and it is for us to choose whether we will enter those great enterprises upon a footing of advantage and of honor or upon a footing of disadvantage and distrust.

Therefore, from every point of view, I challenge the opponents of this treaty to show cause why it should not be ratified. I challenge them to show cause why there should be any hesitation in ratifying it. I do not understand delays. I do not understand covert processes of opposition. It is time that we knew where we shall stand, for observe, my fellow citizens, the negotiation of treaties rests with the Executive of the United States. When the Senate has acted, it will be for me to determine whether its action constitutes an adoption or a rejection, and I beg the gentlemen who are responsible for the action of the United States Senate to make it perfectly clear whether it is an adoption or a rejection. I do not wish to draw doubtful conclusions. I do not wish to do injustice to the process of any honest mind. But when that treaty is acted upon I must know whether it means that we have ratified it or rejected it, and I feel confident that I am speaking for the people of the United States.

Address at Pueblo, Colo.

September 25, 1919

Mr. Chairman and Fellow Countrymen:

It is with a great deal of genuine pleasure that I find myself in Pueblo, and I feel it a compliment that I should be permitted to be the first speaker in this beautiful hall. One of the advantages of this hall, as I look about, is that you are not too far away from me, because there is nothing so reassuring to men who are trying to express the public sentiment as getting into real personal contact with their fellow citizens. I have gained a renewed impression as I have crossed the continent this time of the homogeneity of this great people to whom we belong. They come from many stocks, but they are all of one kind. They come from many origins, but they are all shot through with the same principles and desire the same righteous and honest things. I have received a more inspiring impression this time of the public opinion of the United States than it was ever my privilege to receive before.

The chief pleasure of my trip has been that it has nothing to do with my personal fortunes, that it has nothing to do with my personal reputation, that it has nothing to do with anything except great principles uttered by Americans of all sorts and of all parties which we are now trying to realize at this crisis of the affairs of the world. But there have been unpleasant impressions as well as pleasant impressions, my fellow citizens, as I have crossed the continent. I have perceived more and more that men have been busy creating an absolutely false impression of what the treaty of peace and the covenant of the League of Nations contain and mean. I find, moreover, that there is an organized propaganda against the League of Nations and against the treaty proceeding from exactly the same sources that the organized propaganda proceeded

from which threatened this country here and there with disloyalty, and I want to say—I can not say too often—any man who carries a hyphen about with him carries a dagger that he is ready to plunge into the vitals of this Republic whenever he gets ready. If I can catch any man with a hyphen in this great contest I will know that I have got an enemy of the Republic. My fellow citizens, it is only certain bodies of foreign sympathics, certain bodies of sympathy with foreign nations that are organized against this great document which the American representatives have brought back from Paris. Therefore, in order to clear away the mists, in order to remove the impressions, in order to check the falsehoods that have clustered around this great subject, I want to tell you a few very simple things about the treaty and the covenant.

Do not think of this treaty of peace as merely a settlement with Germany. It is that. It is a very severe settlement with Germany, but there is not anything in it that she did not earn. Indeed, she earned more than she can ever be able to pay for, and the punishment exacted of her is not a punishment greater than she can bear, and it is absolutely necessary in order that no other nation may ever plot such a thing against humanity and civilization. But the treaty is so much more than that. It is not merely a settlement with Germany; it is a readjustment of those great injustices which underlie the whole structure of European and Asiatic society. This is only the first of several treaties. They are all constructed upon the same plan. The Austrian treaty follows the same lines. The treaty with Hungary follows the same lines. The treaty with Bulgaria follows the same lines. The treaty with Turkey, when it is formulated, will follow the same lines. What are those lines? They are based upon the purpose to see that every government dealt with in this great settlement is put in the hands of the people and taken out of the hands of coteries and of sovereigns who had no right

to rule over the people. It is a people's treaty, that accomplishes by a great sweep of practical justice the liberation of men who never could have liberated themselves, and the power of the most powerful nations has been devoted not to their aggrandizement but to the liberation of people whom they could have put under their control if they had chosen to do so. Not one foot of territory is demanded by the conquerors, not one single item of submission to their authority is demanded by them. The men who sat around that table in Paris knew that the time had come when the people were no longer going to consent to live under masters, but were going to live the lives that they chose themselves, to live under such governments as they chose themselves to erect. That is the fundamental principle of this great settlement.

And we did not stop with that. We added a great international charter for the rights of labour. Reject this treaty, impair it, and this is the consequence to the laboring men of the world, that there is no international tribunal which can bring the moral judgments of the world to bear upon the great labour questions of the day. What we need to do with regard to the labour questions of the day, my fellow countrymen, is to lift them into the light, is to lift them out of the haze and distraction of passion, of hostility, not into the calm spaces where men look at things without passion. The more men you get into a great discussion the more you exclude passion. Just so soon as the calm judgment of the world is directed upon the question of justice to labour, labour is going to have a forum such as it never was supplied with before, and men everywhere are going to see that the problem of labour is nothing more nor less than the problem of the elevation of humanity. We must see that all the questions which have disturbed the world, all the questions which have eaten into the confidence of men toward their governments, all the questions which have disturbed the processes of industry, shall be brought

out where men of all points of view, men of all attitudes of mind, men of all kinds of experience, may contribute their part to the settlement of the great questions which we must settle and can not ignore.

At the front of this great treaty is put the covenant of the League of Nations. It will also be at the front of the Austrian treaty and the Hungarian treaty and the Bulgarian treaty and the treaty with Turkey. Every one of them will contain the covenant of the League of Nations, because you can not work any of them without the covenant of the League of Nations. Unless you get the united, concerted purpose and power of the great Governments of the world behind this settlement, it will fall down like a house of cards. There is only one power to put behind the liberation of mankind, and that is the power of mankind. It is the power of the united moral forces of the world, and in the covenant of the League of Nations the moral forces of the world are mobilized. For what purpose? Reflect, my fellow citizens, that the membership of this great League is going to include all the great fighting nations of the world, as well as the weak ones. It is not for the present going to include Germany, but for the time being Germany is not a great fighting country. All the nations that have power that can be mobilized are going to be members of this League, including the United States. And what do they unite for? They enter into a solemn promise to one another that they will never use their power against one another for aggression; that they never will impair the territorial integrity of a neighbor; that they never will interfere with the political independence of a neighbor; that they will abide by the principle that great populations are entitled to determine their own destiny and that they will not interfere with that destiny; and that no matter what differences arise amongst them they will never resort to war without first having done one or other of two things—either submitted the

matter of controversy to arbitration, in which case they agree to abide by the result without question, or submitted it to the consideration of the council of the League of Nations, laying before that council all the documents, all the facts, agreeing that the council can publish the documents and the facts to the whole world, agreeing that there shall be six months allowed for the mature consideration of those facts by the council, and agreeing that at the expiration of the six months, even if they are not then ready to accept the advice of the council with regard to the settlement of the dispute, they will still not go to war for another three months. In other words, they consent, no matter what happens, to submit every matter of difference between them to the judgment of mankind, and just so certainly as they do that, my fellow citizens, war will be in the far background, war will be pushed out of that foreground of terror in which it has kept the world for generation after generation, and men will know that there will be a calm time of deliberate counsel. The most dangerous thing for a bad cause is to expose it to the opinion of the world. The most certain way that you can prove that a man is mistaken is by letting all his neighbors know what he thinks, by letting all his neighbors discuss what he thinks, and if he is in the wrong you will notice that he will stay at home, he will not walk on the street. He will be afraid of the eyes of his neighbors. He will be afraid of their judgment of his character. He will know that his cause is lost unless he can sustain it by the arguments of right and of justice. The same law that applies to individuals applies to nations.

But, you say, "We have heard that we might be at a disadvantage in the League of Nations." Well, whoever told you that either was deliberately falsifying or he had not read the covenant of the League of Nations. I leave him the choice. I want to give you a very simple account of the organization of the League of Nations and let you

judge for yourselves. It is a very simple organization. The power of the League, or rather the activities of the League, lie in two bodies. There is the council, which consists of one representative from each of the principal allied and associated powers—that is to say, the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan, along with four other representatives of smaller powers chosen out of the general body of the membership of the League. The council is the source of every active policy of the League, and no active policy of the League can be adopted without a unanimous vote of the council. That is explicitly stated in the covenant itself. Does it not evidently follow that the League of Nations can adopt no policy whatever without the consent of the United States? The affirmative vote of the representative of the United States is necessary in every case. Now, you have heard of six votes belonging to the British Empire. Those six votes are not in the council. They are in the assembly, and the interesting thing is that the assembly does not vote. I must qualify that statement a little, but essentially it is absolutely true. In every matter in which the assembly is given a voice, and there are only four or five, its vote does not count unless concurred in by the representatives of all the nations represented on the council, so that there is no validity to any vote of the assembly unless in that vote also the representative of the United States concurs. That one vote of the United States is as big as the six votes of the British Empire. I am not jealous for advantage, my fellow citizens, but I think that is a perfectly safe situation. There is no validity in a vote, either by the council or the assembly, in which we do not concur. So much for the statements about the six votes of the British Empire.

Look at it in another aspect. The assembly is the talking body. The assembly was created in order that anybody that purposed anything wrong should be subjected to the awkward circumstance that everybody could talk

about it. This is the great assembly in which all the things that are likely to disturb the peace of the world or the good understanding between nations are to be exposed to the general view, and I want to ask you if you think it was unjust, unjust to the United States, that speaking parts should be assigned to the several portions of the British Empire? Do you think it unjust that there should be some spokesman in debate for that fine little stout Republic down in the Pacific, New Zealand? Do you think it was unjust that Australia should be allowed to stand up and take part in the debate—Australia, from which we have learned some of the most useful progressive policies of modern times, a little nation only five million in a great continent, but counting for several times five in its activities and in its interest in liberal reform? Do you think it unjust that that little Republic down in South Africa, whose gallant resistance to being subjected to any outside authority at all we admired for so many months and whose fortunes we followed with such interest, should have a speaking part? Great Britain obliged South Africa to submit to her sovereignty, but she immediately after that felt that it was convenient and right to hand the whole self-government of that colony over to the very men whom she had beaten. The representatives of South Africa in Paris were two of the most distinguished generals of the Boer Army, two of the realest men I ever met, two men that could talk sober counsel and wise advice, along with the best statesmen in Europe. To exclude Gen. Botha and Gen. Smuts from the right to stand up in the parliament of the world and say something concerning the affairs of mankind would be absurd. And what about Canada? Is not Canada a good neighbor? I ask you, Is not Canada more likely to agree with the United States than with Great Britain? Canada has a speaking part. And then, for the first time in the history of the world, that great voiceless multitude, that throng hundreds of millions strong

in India, has a voice, and I want to testify that some of the wisest and most dignified figures in the peace conference at Paris came from India, men who seemed to carry in their minds an older wisdom than the rest of us had, whose traditions ran back into so many of the unhappy fortunes of mankind that they seemed very useful counselors as to how some ray of hope and some prospect of happiness could be opened to its people. I for my part have no jealousy whatever of those five speaking parts in the assembly. Those speaking parts can not translate themselves into five votes that can in any matter override the voice and purpose of the United States.

Let us sweep aside all this language of jealousy. Let us be big enough to know the facts and to welcome the facts, because the facts are based upon the principle that America has always fought for, namely, the equality of self-governing peoples, whether they were big or little—not counting men, but counting rights, not counting representation, but counting the purpose of that representation. When you hear an opinion quoted you do not count the number of persons who hold it; you ask, "Who said that?" You weigh opinions, you do not count them, and the beauty of all democracies is that every voice can be heard, every voice can have its effect, every voice can contribute to the general judgment that is finally arrived at. That is the object of democracy. Let us accept what America has always fought for, and accept it with pride that America showed the way and made the proposal. I do not mean that America made the proposal in this particular instance; I mean that the principle was an American principle, proposed by America.

When you come to the heart of the covenant, my fellow citizens, you will find it in Article X, and I am very much interested to know that the other things have been blown away like bubbles. There is nothing in the other contentions with regard to the League of Nations, but there is

something in Article X that you ought to realize and ought to accept or reject. Article X is the heart of the whole matter. What is Article X? I never am certain that I can from memory give a literal repetition of its language, but I am sure that I can give an exact interpretation of its meaning. Article X provides that every member of the League convenants to respect and preserve the territorial integrity and existing political independence of every other member of the League as against external aggression. Not against internal disturbance. There was not a man at that table who did not admit the sacredness of the right of self-determination, the sacredness of the right of any body of people to say that they would not continue to live under the Government they were then living under, and under Article XI of the covenant they are given a place to say whether they will live under it or not. For following Article X is Article XI, which makes it the right of any member of the League at any time to call attention to anything, anywhere, that is likely to disturb the peace of the world or the good understanding between nations upon which the peace of the world depends. I want to give you an illustration of what that would mean.

You have heard a great deal—something that was true and a great deal that was false—about that provision of the treaty which hands over to Japan the rights which Germany enjoyed in the Province of Shantung in China. In the first place, Germany did not enjoy any rights there that other nations had not already claimed. For my part, my judgment, my moral judgment, is against the whole set of concessions. They were all of them unjust to China, they ought never to have been exacted, they were all exacted by duress from a great body of thoughtful and ancient and helpless people. There never was any right in any of them. Thank God, America never asked for any, never dreamed of asking for any. But when Germany got this concession in 1898, the Government of the United

States made no protest whatever. That was not because the Government of the United States was not in the hands of high-minded and conscientious men. It was. William McKinley was President and John Hay was Secretary of State—as safe hands to leave the honor of the United States in as any that you can cite. They made no protest because the state of international law at that time was that it was none of their business unless they could show that the interests of the United States were affected, and the only thing that they could show with regard to the interests of the United States was that Germany might close the doors of Shantung Province against the trade of the United States. They, therefore, demanded and obtained promises that we could continue to sell merchandise in Shantung. Immediately following that concession to Germany there was a concession to Russia of the same sort, of Port Arthur, and Port Arthur was handed over subsequently to Japan on the very territory of the United States. Don't you remember that when Russia and Japan got into war with one another the war was brought to a conclusion by a treaty written at Portsmouth, N. H., and in that treaty without the slightest intimation from any authoritative sources in America that the Government of the United States had any objection, Port Arthur, Chinese territory, was turned over to Japan? I want you distinctly to understand that there is no thought of criticism in my mind. I am expounding to you a state of international law. Now, read Articles X and XI. You will see that international law is revolutionized by putting morals into it. Article X says that no member of the League, and that includes all these nations that have demanded these things unjustly of China, shall impair the territorial integrity or the political independence of any other member of the League. China is going to be a member of the League. Article XI says that any member of the League can call attention to anything that is likely to

disturb the peace of the world or the good understanding between nations, and China is for the first time in the history of mankind afforded a standing before the jury of the world. I, for my part, have a profound sympathy for China, and I am proud to have taken part in an arrangement which promises the protection of the world to the rights of China. The whole atmosphere of the world is changed by a thing like that, my fellow citizens. The whole international practice of the world is revolutionized.

But you will say, "What is the second sentence of Article X? That is what gives very disturbing thoughts." The second sentence is that the council of the League shall advise what steps, if any, are necessary to carry out the guaranty of the first sentence, namely, that the members will respect and preserve the territorial integrity and political independence of the other members. I do not know any other meaning for the word "advise" except "advise." The council advises, and it can not advise without the vote of the United States. Why gentlemen should fear that the Congress of the United States would be advised to do something that it did not want to do I frankly can not imagine, because they can not even be advised to do anything unless their own representative has participated in the advice. It may be that that will impair somewhat the vigor of the League, but, nevertheless, the fact is so, that we are not obliged to take any advice except our own, which to any man who wants to go his own course is a very satisfactory state of affairs. Every man regards his own advice as best, and I dare say every man mixes his own advice with some thought of his own interest. Whether we use it wisely or unwisely, we can use the vote of the United States to make impossible drawing the United States into any enterprise that she does not care to be drawn into.

Yet Article X strikes at the taproot of war. Article X

is a statement that the very things that have always been sought in imperialistic wars are henceforth forgone by every ambitious nation in the world. I would have felt very lonely, my fellow countrymen, and I would have felt very much disturbed if, sitting at the peace table in Paris, I had supposed that I was expounding my own ideas. Whether you believe it or not, I know the relative size of my own ideas; I know how they stand related in bulk and proportion to the moral judgments of my fellow countrymen, and I proposed nothing whatever at the peace table at Paris that I had not sufficiently certain knowledge embodied the moral judgment of the citizens of the United States. I had gone over there with, so to say, explicit instructions. Don't you remember that we laid down fourteen points which should contain the principles of the settlement? They were not my points. In every one of them I was conscientiously trying to read the thought of the people of the United States, and after I uttered those points I had every assurance given me that could be given me that they did speak the moral judgment of the United States and not my single judgment. Then when it came to that critical period just a little less than a year ago, when it was evident that the war was coming to its critical end, all the nations engaged in the war accepted those fourteen principles explicitly as the basis of the armistice and the basis of the peace. In those circumstances I crossed the ocean under bond to my own people and to the other governments with which I was dealing. The whole specification of the method of settlement was written down and accepted beforehand, and we were architects building on those specifications.

It reassures me and fortifies my position to find how before I went over men whose judgment the United States has often trusted were of exactly the same opinion that I went abroad to express. Here is something I want to read from Theodore Roosevelt:

"The one effective move for obtaining peace is by an agreement among all the great powers in which each should pledge itself not only to abide by the decisions of a common tribunal but to back its decisions by force. The great civilized nations should combine by solemn agreement in a great world league for the peace of righteousness; a court should be established. A changed and amplified Hague court would meet the requirements, composed of representatives from each nation, whose representatives are sworn to act as judges in each case and not in a representative capacity." Now there is Article X. He goes on and says this: "The nations should agree on certain rights that should not be questioned, such as territorial integrity, their right to deal with their domestic affairs, and with such matters as whom they should admit to citizenship. All such guarantee each of their number in possession of these rights."

Now, the other specification is in the covenant. The covenant in another portion guarantees to the members the independent control of their domestic questions. There is not a leg for these gentlemen to stand on when they say that the interests of the United States are not safeguarded in the very points where we are most sensitive. You do not need to be told again that the covenant expressly says that nothing in this covenant shall be construed as affecting the validity of the Monroe Doctrine, for example. You could not be more explicit than that. And every point of interest is covered, partly for one very interesting reason. This is not the first time that the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate of the United States has read and considered this covenant. I brought it to this country in March last in a tentative, provisional form, in practically the form that it now has, with the exception of certain additions which I shall mention immediately. I asked the Foreign Relations Committees of both Houses to come to the White House and we spent a long evening in the

frankest discussion of every portion that they wished to discuss. They made certain specific suggestions as to what should be contained in this document when it was to be revised. I carried those suggestions to Paris, and every one of them was adopted. What more could I have done? What more could have been obtained? The very matters upon which these gentlemen were most concerned were, the right of withdrawal, which is now expressly stated; the safeguarding of the Monroe Doctrine, which is now accomplished; the exclusion from action by the League of domestic questions, which is now accomplished. All along the line, every suggestion of the United States was adopted after the covenant had been drawn up in its first form and had been published for the criticism of the world. There is a very true sense in which I can say this is a tested American document.

I am dwelling upon these points, my fellow citizens, in spite of the fact that I dare say to most of you they are perfectly well known, because in order to meet the present situation we have got to know what we are dealing with. We are not dealing with the kind of document which this is represented by some gentlemen to be; and inasmuch as we are dealing with a document simon-pure in respect of the very principles we have professed and lived up to, we have got to do one or other of two things—we have got to adopt it or reject it. There is no middle course. You can not go in on a special-privilege basis of your own. I take it that you are too proud to ask to be exempted from responsibilities which the other members of the League will carry. We go in upon equal terms or we do not go in at all; and if we do not go in, my fellow citizens, think of the tragedy of that result—the only sufficient guaranty to the peace of the world withheld! Ourselves drawn apart with that dangerous pride which means that we shall be ready to take care of ourselves, and that means that we shall maintain great standing armies and an irresistible

navy; that means we shall have the organization of a military nation; that means we shall have a general staff, with the kind of power that the general staff of Germany had; to mobilize this great manhood of the Nation when it pleases, all the energy of our young men drawn into the thought and preparation for war. What of our pledges to the men that lie dead in France? We said that they went over there not to prove the prowess of America or her readiness for another war but to see to it that there never was such a war again. It always seems to make it difficult for me to say anything, my fellow citizens, when I think of my clients in this case. My clients are the children; my clients are the next generation. They do not know what promises and bonds I undertook when I ordered the armies of the United States to the soil of France, but I know, and I intend to redeem my pledges to the children; they shall not be sent upon a similar errand.

Again and again, my fellow citizens, mothers who lost their sons in France have come to me and, taking my hand, have shed tears upon it not only, but they have added, "God bless you, Mr. President!" Why, my fellow citizens, should they pray God to bless me? I advised the Congress of the United States to create the situation that led to the death of their sons. I ordered their sons oversea. I consented to their sons being put in the most difficult parts of the battle line, where death was certain, as in the impenetrable difficulties of the forest of Argonne. Why should they weep upon my hand and call down the blessings of God upon me? Because they believe that their boys died for something that vastly transcends any of the immediate and palpable objects of the war. They believe, and they rightly believe, that their sons saved the liberty of the world. They believe that wrapped up with the liberty of the world is the continuous protection of that liberty by the concerted powers of all civilized people. They believe that this sacrifice was made in order that other sons should

not be called upon for a similar gift—the gift of life, the gift of all that died—and if we did not see this thing through, if we fulfilled the dearest present wish of Germany and now dissociated ourselves from those alongside whom we fought in the war, would not something of the halo go away from the gun over the mantelpiece, or the sword? Would not the old uniform lose something of its significance? These men were crusaders. They were not going forth to prove the might of the United States. They were going forth to prove the might of justice and right, and all the world accepted them as crusaders, and their transcendent achievement has made all the world believe in America as it believes in no other nation organized in the modern world. There seems to me to stand between us and the rejection or qualification of this treaty the serried ranks of those boys in khaki, not only these boys who came home, but those dear ghosts that still deploy upon the fields of France.

My friends, on last Decoration Day I went to a beautiful hillside near Paris, where was located the cemetery of Suresnes, a cemetery given over to the burial of the American dead. Behind me on the slopes was rank upon rank of living American soldiers, and lying before me upon the levels of the plain was rank upon rank of departed American soldiers. Right by the side of the stand where I spoke there was a little group of French women who had adopted those graves, had made themselves mothers of those dear ghosts by putting flowers every day upon those graves, taking them as their own sons, their own beloved, because they had died in the same cause—France was free and the world was free because America had come! I wish some men in public life who are now opposing the settlement for which these men died could visit such a spot as that. I wish that the thought that comes out of those graves could penetrate their consciousness. I wish that they could feel the moral obligation that rests upon us not to go back on those boys,

but to see the thing through, to see it through to the end and make good their redemption of the world. For nothing less depends upon this decision, nothing less than the liberation and salvation of the world.

You will say, "Is the League an absolute guaranty against war?" No; I do not know any absolute guaranty against the errors of human judgment or the violence of human passion, but I tell you this: With a cooling space of nine months for human passion, not much of it will keep hot. I had a couple of friends who were in the habit of losing their tempers, and when they lost their tempers they were in the habit of using very unparliamentary language. Some of their friends induced them to make a promise that they never would swear inside the town limits. When the impulse next came upon them, they took a street car to go out of town to swear, and by the time they got out of town they did not want to swear. They came back convinced that they were just what they were, a couple of unspeakable fools, and the habit of getting angry and of swearing suffered great inroads upon it by that experience. Now, illustrating the great by the small, that is true of the passions of nations. It is true of the passions of men however you combine them. Give them space to cool off. I ask you this: If it is not an absolute insurance against war, do you want no insurance at all? Do you want nothing? Do you want not only no probability that war will not recur, but the probability that it will recur? The arrangements of justice do not stand of themselves, my fellow citizens. The arrangements of this treaty are just, but they need the support of the combined power of the great nations of the world. And they will have that support. Now that the mists of this great question have cleared away, I believe that men will see the truth, eye to eye and face to face. There is one thing that the American people always rise to and extend their hand to, and

that is the truth of justice and of liberty and of peace. We have accepted that truth and we are going to be led by it, and it is going to lead us, and through us the world, out into pastures of quietness and peace such as the world never dreamed of before.

[EDITORIAL NOTE: *After delivering the address at Pueblo, and while on the special train bound for Wichita, Kansas, on September 26, 1919, President Wilson was stricken with an illness from which he never recovered, although he lived for more than four years. The speaking tour was abandoned and the President was rushed to Washington. Forty addresses had been delivered within twenty-two days, in seventeen States, the speaker traveling eight thousand miles.*

It was announced at the time that the President was suffering from nervous exhaustion, dating back to an attack of influenza at Paris in April. His condition was not alarming. A week later, however, there came a turn for the worse, and the physicians' bulletin stated that he was "a very sick man." No complete official diagnosis was ever issued, but many persons chose to believe that the President had suffered a stroke of apoplexy.

The presidential patient sat up in a chair for the first time on November 11; received, while in bed, a Senate sub-committee of two on December 5; was able to walk "without assistance and without fatigue" on February 10; took a motor ride on March 3, and on April 14 met with his Cabinet for the first time in six months.

Meanwhile, however, the President continued to write messages and other state papers.]

Call for a National Industrial Conference

September 17, 1919

[While at San Francisco, on the speaking tour, the President sent the following telegram to twenty-two men whom he had selected.]

I have called a conference at Washington for October 6 for the purpose of discussing the labour situation in the country and the possibility of formulating plans for the development of a new relationship between capital and labour. I beg that you will accept appointment as one of the representatives of the general public in that conference. There will be twenty-two representatives of the public and an equivalent number of representatives of various bodies of organized labour and organized employers. I sincerely hope that it will be possible for you to undertake this very important service.

An Appeal to the Industrial Conference to Agree Upon a Program

October 22, 1919

To the Ladies and Gentlemen of the Industrial Conference:

I am advised by your chairman that you have come to a situation which appears to threaten the life of your conference, and because of that I am presuming to address a word of very solemn appeal to you as Americans. It is not for me to assess the blame for the present condition.

I do not speak in a spirit of criticism of any individual or of any group. But having called this conference, I feel that my temporary indisposition should not bar the way to a frank expression of the seriousness of the position in which this country will be placed should you adjourn without having convinced the American people that you had

exhausted your resourcefulness and your patience in an effort to come to some common agreement.

At a time when the nations of the world are endeavoring to find a way to avoid international war, are we to confess that there is no method to be found for carrying on industry except in the spirit and with the very method of war? Must suspicion and hatred and force rule us in civil life? Are our industrial leaders and our industrial workers to live together without faith in each other, constantly struggling for advantage over each other, doing naught but what is compelled?

My friends, this would be an intolerable outlook, a prospect unworthy of the large things done by this people in the mastering of this continent—indeed, it would be an invitation to national disaster. From such a possibility my mind turns away, for my confidence is abiding that in this land we have learned how to accept the general judgment upon matters that affect the public weal. And this is the very heart and soul of democracy.

It is my understanding that you have divided upon one portion only of a possible large program which has not fully been developed. Before a severance is effected, based upon present differences, I believe you should stand together for the development of that full program touching the many questions within the broad scope of your investigations.

It was in my mind when this conference was called that you would concern yourselves with the discovery of those methods by which a measurable cooperation within industry may have been secured, and if new machinery needs to be designed by which a minimum of conflict between employers and employes may reasonably be hoped for, that we should make an effort to secure its adoption.

It cannot be expected that at every step all parties will agree upon each proposition or method suggested. It is to be expected, however, that as a whole a plan or program can be agreed upon which will advance further the produc-

tive capacity of America through the establishment of a surer and heartier cooperation between all the elements engaged in industry. The public expects not less than that you shall have that one end in view and stay together until the way is found leading to that end or until it is revealed that the men who work and the men who manage American industry are so set upon divergent paths that all efforts at cooperation are doomed to failure.

I renew my appeal with full comprehension of the almost incomparable importance of your tasks to this and to other peoples, and with full faith in the high patriotism and good faith of each other that you push your task to a happy conclusion.

(Signed) Woodrow Wilson.

A Statement by the President on the Moral and Legal Wrong of a Bituminous Coal Strike

October 25, 1919

On September 23, 1919, the convention of the United Mine Workers of America at Cleveland, Ohio, adopted a proposal declaring that all contracts in the bituminous field shall be declared as having automatically expired November 1, 1919, and making various demands, including a 60 per cent increase in wages and the adoption of a six-hour workday and a five-day week; and providing that, in the event a satisfactory wage agreement should not be secured for the central competitive field before November 1, 1919, the national officials should be authorized and instructed to call a general strike of all bituminous miners and mine workers throughout the United States, effective November 1, 1919.

Pursuant to these instructions, the officers of the organization have issued a call to make the strike effective No-

vember 1. This is one of the gravest steps ever proposed in this country, affecting the economic welfare and the domestic comfort and health of the people. It is proposed to abrogate an agreement as to wages which was made with the sanction of the United States Fuel Administration and which was to run during the continuance of the war, but not beyond April 1, 1920.

This strike is proposed at a time when the Government is making the most earnest effort to reduce the cost of living and has appealed with success to other classes of workers to postpone similar disputes until a reasonable opportunity has been afforded for dealing with the cost of living. It is recognized that the strike would practically shut off the country's supply of its principal fuel at a time when interference with that supply is calculated to create a disastrous fuel famine. All interests would be affected alike by a strike of this character, and its victims would be not the rich only, but the poor and the needy as well, those least able to provide in advance a fuel supply for domestic use. It would involve the shutting down of countless industries and the throwing out of employment of a large part of the workers of the country. It would involve stopping the operation of railroads, electric light and gas plants, street railway lines and other public utilities, and the shipping to and from this country, thus preventing our giving aid to the allied countries with supplies which they so seriously need.

The country is confronted with this prospect at a time when the war itself is still a fact, when the world is still in suspense as to negotiations for peace, when our troops are still being transported, and when their means of transport is in urgent need of fuel.

From whatever angle the subject may be viewed, it is apparent that such a strike in such circumstances would be the most far-reaching plan ever presented in this country to limit the facilities of production and distribution of a

necessity of life and thus indirectly to restrict the production and distribution of all the necessaries of life. A strike under these circumstances is not only unjustifiable, it is unlawful.

The action proposed has apparently been taken without any vote upon the specific proposition by the individual members of the United Mine Workers of America throughout the United States, an almost unprecedented proceeding. I cannot believe that any right of any American worker needs for its protection the taking of this extraordinary step, and I am convinced that when the time and manner are considered, it constitutes a fundamental attack, which is wrong both morally and legally, upon the rights of society and upon the welfare of our country. I feel convinced that individual members of the United Mine Workers would not vote, upon full consideration, in favor of such a strike under these conditions.

When a movement reaches the point where it appears to involve practically the entire productive capacity of the country with respect to one of the most vital necessities of daily domestic and industrial life, and when the movement is asserted in the circumstances I have stated and at a time and in a manner calculated to involve the maximum of danger to the public welfare in this critical hour of our country's life, the public interest becomes the paramount consideration.

In these circumstances I solemnly request both the national and the local officers and also the individual members of the United Mine Workers of America to recall all orders looking to a strike on November 1 and to take whatever steps may be necessary to prevent any stoppage of work.

It is time for plain speaking. These matters with which we now deal touch not only the welfare of a class, but vitally concern the well-being, the comfort, and the very life of all the people. I feel it my duty in the public interest to declare that any attempt to carry out the purposes of

this strike and thus to paralyze the industry of the country, with the consequent suffering and distress of all our people, must be considered a grave moral and legal wrong against the Government and the people of the United States. I can do nothing less than to say that the law will be enforced and means will be found to protect the interests of the nation in any emergency that may arise out of this unhappy business.

I express no opinion on the merits of the controversy. I have already suggested a plan by which a settlement may be reached, and I hold myself in readiness at the request of either or both sides to appoint at once a tribunal to investigate all the facts with a view to aiding in the earliest possible orderly settlement of the questions at issue between the coal operators and the coal miners, to the end that the just rights, not only of those interests but also of the general public, may be fully protected.

The First Anniversary of Armistice Day

(A Message to the Country)

November 11, 1919

To my Fellow-Countrymen:

A year ago to-day our enemies laid down their arms in accordance with an armistice which rendered them impotent to renew hostilities and gave to the world an assured opportunity to reconstruct its shattered order and to work out in peace a new and juster set of international relations. The soldiers and people of the European Allies had fought and endured for more than four years to uphold the barrier of civilization against the aggressions of armed force. We ourselves had been in the conflict something more than a year and a half.

With splendid forgetfulness of mere personal concerns we remodeled our industries, concentrated our financial resources, increased our agricultural output, and assembled a great army, so that at the last our power was a decisive factor in the victory. We were able to bring the vast resources, material and moral, of a great and free people to the assistance of our associates in Europe, who had suffered and sacrificed without limit in the cause for which we fought.

Out of this victory there arose new possibilities of political freedom and economic concert. The war showed us the strength of great nations acting together for high purposes, and the victory of arms foretells the enduring conquests which can be made in peace when nations act justly and in furtherance of the common interests of men. To us in America the reflections of Armistice Day will be filled with solemn pride in the heroism of those who died in the country's service, and with gratitude for the victory, both because of the thing from which it has freed us and because of the opportunity it has given America to show her sympathy with peace and justice in the councils of nations.

WOODROW WILSON.

[EDITORIAL NOTE: *The treaty of peace had been presented to the Senate, for its approval, on July* 10; *and the provisions of the League of Nations covenant, especially, had met with some opposition. The President thereupon had undertaken a western speaking tour to arouse the country to his point of view, leaving Washington on September* 3. *Just one week later the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations—Mr. Lodge (Rep., Mass.) being chairman—presented a majority report on the treaty which proposed many amendments and four reservations. The principal reservation declared that the military or naval forces of the United States could not be employed, under Article X of the League covenant, without authorization of Congress.*

On November 19, 1919, *the peace treaty came to a vote in the Senate and was rejected, both without the reservations and with*

them. It was necessary to have the approval of two-thirds of the ninety-six Senators, or sixty-four; and the supporters of the treaty with reservations numbered only fifty-five. On the day preceding the vote the President had written to Senator Hitchcock (Dem., Neb.) that the Republican reservations amounted to nullification of the treaty itself. Thus the supporters of the President voted against ratifying the treaty with reservations.]

Seventh Annual Message to Congress

December 2, 1919

(Communicated in writing)

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I sincerely regret that I cannot be present at the opening of this session of the Congress. I am thus prevented from presenting in as direct a way as I could wish the many questions that are pressing for solution at this time. Happily, I have had the advantage of the advice of the heads of the several executive departments who have kept in close touch with affairs in their detail and whose thoughtful recommendations I earnestly second.

In the matter of the railroads and the readjustment of their affairs growing out of federal control, I shall take the liberty at a later date of addressing you.

I hope that Congress will bring to a conclusion at this session legislation looking to the establishment of a budget system. That there should be one single authority responsible for the making of all appropriations and that appropriations should be made not independently of each other, but with reference to one single comprehensive plan of expenditure properly related to the nation's income, there can be no doubt. I believe the burden of preparing the budget must, in the nature of the case, if the work is to be properly done and responsibility concentrated instead of divided, rest upon the executive. The budget so prepared

should be submitted to and approved or amended by a single committee of each House of Congress and no single appropriation should be made by the Congress, except such as may have been included in the budget prepared by the executive or added by the particular committee of Congress charged with the budget legislation.

Another and not less important aspect of the problem is the ascertainment of the economy and efficiency with which the moneys appropriated are expended. Under existing law the only audit is for the purpose of ascertaining whether expenditures have been lawfully made within the appropriations. No one is authorized or equipped to ascertain whether the money has been spent wisely, economically and effectively. The auditors should be highly trained officials with permanent tenure in the Treasury Department, free of obligations to or motives of consideration for this or any subsequent administration, and authorized and empowered to examine into and make report upon the methods employed and the results obtained by the executive departments of the Government. Their reports should be made to the Congress and to the Secretary of the Treasury.

I trust that the Congress will give its immediate consideration to the problem of future taxation. Simplification of the income and profits taxes has become an immediate necessity. These taxes performed indispensable service during the war. They must, however, be simplified, not only to save the taxpayer inconvenience and expense, but in order that his liability may be made certain and definite.

With reference to the details of the Revenue Law, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue will lay before you for your consideration certain amendments necessary or desirable in connection with the administration of the law—recommendations which have my approval and support. It is of the utmost importance that in dealing with this matter the present law should not be disturbed so far as regards taxes for the

calendar year 1920, payable in the calendar year 1921. The Congress might well consider whether the higher rates of income and profits taxes can in peace times be effectively productive of revenue, and whether they may not, on the contrary, be destructive of business activity and productive of waste and inefficiency. There is a point at which in peace times high rates of income and profits taxes discourage energy, remove the incentive to new enterprise, encourage extravagant expenditures and produce industrial stagnation, with consequent unemployment and other attendant evils.

The problem is not an easy one. A fundamental change has taken place with reference to the position of America in the world's affairs. The prejudice and passions engendered by decades of controversy between two schools of political and economic thought,—the one believers in protection of American industries, the other believers in tariff for revenue only,—must be subordinated to the single consideration of the public interest in the light of utterly changed conditions. Before the war America was heavily the debtor of the rest of the world, and the interest payments she had to make to foreign countries on American securities held abroad, the expenditures of American travelers abroad and the ocean freight charges she had to pay to others, about balanced the value of her pre-war favorable balance of trade. During the war America's exports have been greatly stimulated and increased prices have increased their value. On the other hand, she has purchased a large proportion of the American securities previously held abroad, has loaned some $9,000,000,000 to foreign governments, and has built her own ships. Our favorable balance of trade has thus been greatly increased and Europe has been deprived of the means of meeting it heretofore existing. Europe can have only three ways of meeting the favorable balance of trade in peace times: by imports into this country of gold or of goods, or by establishing new credits.

Europe is in no position at the present time to ship gold to us nor could we contemplate large further imports of gold into this country without concern. The time has nearly passed for international governmental loans and it will take time to develop in this country a market for foreign securities. Anything, therefore, which would tend to prevent foreign countries from settling for our exports by shipments of goods into this country could only have the effect of preventing them from paying for our exports and therefore of preventing the exports from being made. The productivity of the country, greatly stimulated by the war, must find an outlet by exports to foreign countries, and any measures taken to prevent imports will inevitably curtail exports, force curtailment of production, load the banking machinery of the country with credits to carry unsold products and produce industrial stagnation and unemployment. If we want to sell, we must be prepared to buy. Whatever, therefore, may have been our views during the period of growth of American business concerning tariff legislation, we must now adjust our own economic life to a changed condition growing out of the fact that American business is full grown and that America is the greatest capitalist in the world.

No policy of isolation will satisfy the growing needs and opportunities of America. The provincial standards and policies of the past, which have held American business as if in a straitjacket, must yield and give way to the needs and exigencies of the new day in which we live, a day full of hope and promise for American business, if we will but take advantage of the opportunities that are ours for the asking. The recent war has ended our isolation and thrown upon us a great duty and responsibility. The United States must share the expanding world market. The United States desires for itself only equal opportunity with the other nations of the world, and that through the process of friendly cooperation and fair competition the legitimate

interests of the nations concerned may be successfully and equitably adjusted.

There are other matters of importance upon which I urged action at the last session of Congress which are still pressing for solution. I am sure it is not necessary for me again to remind you that there is one immediate and very practicable question resulting from the war which we should meet in the most liberal spirit. It is a matter of recognition and relief to our soldiers. I can do no better than to quote from my last message urging this very action:

"We must see to it that our returning soldiers are assisted in every practicable way to find the places for which they are fitted in the daily work of the country. This can be done by developing and maintaining upon an adequate scale the admirable organization created by the Department of Labour for placing men seeking work; and it can also be done, in at least one very great field, by creating new opportunities for individual enterprise. The Secretary of the Interior has pointed out the way by which returning soldiers may be helped to find and take up land in the hitherto undeveloped regions of the country which the Federal Government has already prepared or can readily prepare for cultivation and also on many of the cutover or neglected areas which lie within the limits of the older States; and I once more take the liberty of recommending very urgently that his plans shall receive the immediate and substantial support of the Congress."

In the matter of tariff legislation, I beg to call your attention to the statements contained in my last message urging legislation with reference to the establishment of the chemical and dyestuffs industry in America:

"Among the industries to which special consideration should be given is that of the manufacture of dyestuffs and related chemicals. Our complete dependence upon German supplies before the war made the interruption of trade a cause of exceptional economic disturbance. The close rela-

tion between the manufacture of dyestuffs, on the one hand, and of explosives and poisonous gases, on the other, moreover, has given the industry an exceptional significance and value. Although the United States will gladly and unhesitatingly join in the programme of international disarmament, it will, nevertheless, be a policy of obvious prudence to make certain of the successful maintenance of many strong and well-equipped chemical plants. The German chemical industry, with which we will be brought into competition, was and may well be again, a thoroughly knit monopoly capable of exercising a competition of a peculiarly insidious and dangerous kind."

During the war the farmer performed a vital and willing service to the nation. By materially increasing the production of his land he supplied America and the Allies with the increased amounts of food necessary to keep their immense armies in the field. He indispensably helped to win the war. But there is now scarcely less need of increasing the production in food and the necessaries of life. I ask the Congress to consider means of encouraging effort along these lines. The importance of doing everything possible to promote production along economical lines, to improve marketing, and to make rural life more attractive and healthful, is obvious. I would urge approval of the plans already proposed to the Congress by the Secretary of Agriculture, to secure the essential facts required for the proper study of this question, through the proposed enlarged programmes for farm management studies and crop estimates. I would urge, also, the continuance of federal participation in the building of good roads, under the terms of existing law and under the direction of present agencies; the need of further action on the part of the States and the Federal Government to preserve and develop our forest resources, especially through the practice of better forestry methods on private holdings and the extension of the publicly owned forests; better support for country schools and the more

definite direction of their courses of study along lines related to rural problems; and fuller provision for sanitation in rural districts and the building up of needed hospital and medical facilities in these localities. Perhaps the way might be cleared for many of these desirable reforms by a fresh, comprehensive survey made of rural conditions by a conference composed of representatives of the farmers and of the agricultural agencies responsible for leadership.

I would call your attention to the widespread condition of political restlessness in our body politic. The causes of this unrest, while various and complicated, are superficial rather than deep seated. Broadly, they arise from or are connected with the failure on the part of our Government to arrive speedily at a just and permanent peace permitting return to normal conditions, from the transfusion of radical theories from seething European centers pending such delay, from heartless profiteering, resulting in the increase of the cost of living, and lastly, from the machinations of passionate and malevolent agitators. With the return to normal conditions this unrest will rapidly disappear. In the meantime, it does much evil. It seems to me that in dealing with this situation Congress should not be impatient or drastic but should seek rather to remove the causes. It should endeavor to bring our country back speedily to a peace basis, with ameliorated living conditions under the minimum of restrictions upon personal liberty that is consistent with our reconstruction problems. And it should arm the Federal Government with power to deal in its criminal courts with those persons who by violent methods would abrogate our time-tested institutions. With the free expression of opinion and with the advocacy of orderly political change, however fundamental, there must be no interference, but towards passion and malevolence tending to incite crime and insurrection under guise of political evolution there should be no leniency. Legislation to this end has been recommended by the Attorney General and

should be enacted. In this direct connection, I would call your attention to my recommendations on August 8th, pointing out legislative measures which would be effective in controlling and bringing down the present cost of living, which contributes so largely to this unrest. On only one of these recommendations has the Congress acted. If the Government's campaign is to be effective it is necessary that the other steps suggested should be acted on at once.

I renew and strongly urge the necessity of the extension of the present Food Control Act as to the period of time in which it shall remain in operation. The Attorney General has submitted a bill providing for an extension of this Act for a period of six months. As it now stands it is limited in operation to the period of the war and becomes inoperative upon the formal proclamation of peace. It is imperative that it should be extended at once. The Department of Justice has built up extensive machinery for the purpose of enforcing its provisions, all of which must be abandoned upon the conclusion of peace unless the provisions of this Act are extended.

During this period the Congress will have an opportunity to make similar permanent provisions and regulations with regard to all goods destined for interstate commerce and to exclude them from interstate shipment, if the requirements of the law are not complied with. Some such regulation is imperatively necessary. The abuses that have grown up in the manipulation of prices by the withholding of foodstuffs and other necessaries of life cannot otherwise be effectively prevented. There can be no doubt of either the necessity or the legitimacy of such measures.

As I pointed out in my last message, publicity can accomplish a great deal in this campaign. The aims of the Government must be clearly brought to the attention of the consuming public, civic organizations and State officials, who are in a position to lend their assistance to our efforts.

You have made available funds with which to carry on this campaign, but there is no provision in the law authorizing their expenditure for the purpose of making the public fully informed about the efforts of the Government. Specific recommendation has been made by the Attorney General in this regard. I would strongly urge upon you its immediate adoption, as it constitutes one of the preliminary steps to this campaign.

I also renew my recommendation that the Congress pass a law regulating cold storage as it is regulated, for example, by the laws of the State of New Jersey, which limit the time during which goods may be kept in storage, prescribe the method of disposing of them if kept beyond the permitted period, and require that goods released from storage shall in all cases bear the date of their receipt. It would materially add to the serviceability of the law, for the purpose we now have in view, if it were also prescribed that all goods released from storage for interstate shipment should have plainly marked upon each package the selling or market price at which they went into storage. By this means the purchaser would always be able to learn what profits stood between him and the producer or the wholesale dealer.

I would also renew my recommendation that all goods destined for interstate commerce should in every case, where their form or package makes it possible, be plainly marked with the price at which they left the hands of the producer.

We should formulate a law requiring a federal license of all corporations engaged in interstate commerce and embodying in the license, or in the conditions under which it is issued, specific regulations designed to secure competitive selling and prevent unconscionable profits in the method of marketing. Such a law would afford a welcome opportunity to effect other much needed reforms in the business of interstate shipment and in the methods of corporations

which are engaged in it; but for the moment I confine my recommendations to the object immediately in hand, which is to lower the cost of living.

No one who has observed the march of events in the last year can fail to note the absolute need of a definite programme to bring about an improvement in the conditions of labour. There can be no settled conditions leading to increased production and a reduction in the cost of living if labour and capital are to be antagonistic instead of partners. Sound thinking and an honest desire to serve the interests of the whole nation, as distinguished from the interests of a class, must be applied to the solution of this great and pressing problem. The failure of other nations to consider this matter in a vigorous way has produced bitterness and jealousies and antagonisms, the food of radicalism. The only way to keep men from agitating against grievances is to remove the grievances. An unwillingness even to discuss these matters produces only dissatisfaction and gives comfort to the extreme elements in our country which endeavor to stir up disturbances in order to provoke governments to embark upon a course of retaliation and repression. The seed of revolution is repression. The remedy for these things must not be negative in character. It must be constructive. It must comprehend the general interest. The real antidote for the unrest which manifests itself is not suppression, but a deep consideration of the wrongs that beset our national life and the application of a remedy.

Congress has already shown its willingness to deal with these industrial wrongs by establishing the eight-hour day as the standard in every field of labour. It has sought to find a way to prevent child labour. It has served the whole country by leading the way in developing the means of preserving and safeguarding lives and health in dangerous industries. It must now help in the difficult task of finding a method that will bring about a genuine democratization of industry, based upon the full recognition of the right of

those who work, in whatever rank, to participate in some organic way in every decision which directly affects their welfare. It is with this purpose in mind that I called a conference to meet in Washington on December 1st, to consider these problems in all their broad aspects, with the idea of bringing about a better understanding between these two interests.

The great unrest throughout the world, out of which has emerged a demand for an immediate consideration of the difficulties between capital and labour, bids us put our own house in order. Frankly, there can be no permanent and lasting settlements between capital and labour which do not recognize the fundamental concepts for which labour has been struggling through the years. The whole world gave its recognition and endorsement to these fundamental purposes in the League of Nations. The statesmen gathered at Versailles recognized the fact that world stability could not be had by reverting to industrial standards and conditions against which the average workman of the world had revolted. It is therefore the task of the statesmen of this new day of change and readjustment to recognize world conditions and to seek to bring about, through legislation, conditions that will mean the ending of age-long antagonisms between capital and labour and that will hopefully lead to the building up of a comradeship which will result not only in greater contentment among the mass of workmen but also bring about a greater production and a greater prosperity to business itself.

To analyze the particulars in the demands of labour is to admit the justice of their complaint in many matters that lie at their basis. The workman demands an adequate wage, sufficient to permit him to live in comfort, unhampered by the fear of poverty and want in his old age. He demands the right to live and the right to work amidst sanitary surroundings, both in home and in workshop, surroundings that develop and do not retard his own health and well-

being; and the right to provide for his children's wants in the matter of health and education. In other words, it is his desire to make the conditions of his life and the lives of those dear to him tolerable and easy to bear.

The establishment of the principles regarding labour laid down in the covenant of the League of Nations offers us the way to industrial peace and conciliation. No other road lies open to us. Not to pursue this one is longer to invite enmities, bitterness, and antagonisms which in the end only lead to industrial and social disaster. The unwilling workman is not a profitable servant. An employee whose industrial life is hedged about by hard and unjust conditions, which he did not create and over which he has no control, lacks that fine spirit of enthusiasm and volunteer effort which are the necessary ingredients of a great producing entity. Let us be frank about this solemn matter. The evidences of world-wide unrest which manifest themselves in violence throughout the world bid us pause and consider the means to be found to stop the spread of this contagious thing before it saps the very vitality of the nation itself. Do we gain strength by withholding the remedy? Or is it not the business of statesmen to treat these manifestations of unrest which meet us on every hand as evidences of an economic disorder and to apply constructive remedies wherever necessary, being sure that in the application of the remedy we touch not the vital tissues of our industrial and economic life? There can be no recession of the tide of unrest until constructive instrumentalities are set up to stem that tide.

Governments must recognize the right of men collectively to bargain for humane objects that have at their base the mutual protection and welfare of those engaged in all industries. Labour must not be longer treated as a commodity. It must be regarded as the activity of human beings, possessed of deep yearnings and desires. The business man gives his best thought to the repair and replenishment of

his machinery, so that its usefulness will not be impaired and its power to produce may always be at its height and kept in full vigor and motion. No less regard ought to be paid to the human machine, which after all propels the machinery of the world and is the great dynamic force that lies back of all industry and progress. Return to the old standards of wage and industry in employment are unthinkable. The terrible tragedy of war which has just ended and which has brought the world to the verge of chaos and disaster would be in vain if there should ensue a return to the conditions of the past. Europe itself, whence has come the unrest which now holds the world at bay, is an example of standpatism in these vital human matters which America might well accept as an example, not to be followed but studiously to be avoided. Europe made labour the differential, and the price of it all is enmity and antagonism and prostrated industry. The right of labour to live in peace and comfort must be recognized by governments, and America should be the first to lay the foundation stones upon which industrial peace shall be built.

Labour not only is entitled to an adequate wage, but capital should receive a reasonable return upon its investment and is entitled to protection at the hands of the government in every emergency. No government worthy of the name can "play" these elements against each other, for there is a mutuality of interest between them which the government must seek to express and to safeguard at all cost.

The right of individuals to strike is inviolate and ought not to be interfered with by any process of government, but there is a predominant right, and that is the right of the government to protect all of its people and to assert its power and majesty against the challenge of any class. The government, when it asserts that right, seeks not to antagonize a class but simply to defend the right of the whole people as against the irreparable harm and injury that might be done by the attempt by any class to usurp a power

that only government itself has a right to exercise as a protection to all.

In the matter of international disputes which have led to war, statesmen have sought to set up as a remedy arbitration for war. Does this not point the way for the settlement of industrial disputes, by the establishment of a tribunal, fair and just alike to all, which will settle industrial disputes which in the past have led to war and disaster? America, witnessing the evil consequences which have followed out of such disputes between these contending forces, must not admit itself impotent to deal with these matters by means of peaceful processes. Surely there must be some method of bringing together in a council of peace and amity these two great interests, out of which will come a happier day of peace and cooperation, a day that will make men more hopeful and enthusiastic in their various tasks, that will make for more comfort and happiness in living and a more tolerable condition among all classes of men. Certainly human intelligence can devise some acceptable tribunal for adjusting the differences between capital and labour.

This is the hour of test and trial for America. By her prowess and strength, and the indomitable courage of her soldiers, she demonstrated her power to vindicate on foreign battlefields her conceptions of liberty and justice. Let not her influence as a mediator between capital and labour be weakened and her own failure to settle matters of purely domestic concern be proclaimed to the world. There are those in this country who threaten direct action to force their will upon a majority. Russia to-day, with its blood and terror, is a painful object lesson of the power of minorities. It makes little difference what minority it is; whether capital or labour, or any other class; no sort of privilege will ever be permitted to dominate this country. We are a partnership or nothing that is worth while. We are a democracy, where the majority are the masters, or all

the hopes and purposes of the men who founded this government have been defeated and forgotten. In America there is but one way by which great reforms can be accomplished and the relief sought by classes obtained, and that is through the orderly processes of representative government. Those who would propose any other method of reform are enemies of this country. America will not be daunted by threats nor lose her composure or calmness in these distressing times. We can afford, in the midst of this day of passion and unrest, to be self-contained and sure. The instrument of all reform in America is the ballot. The road to economic and social reform in America is the straight road of justice to all classes and conditions of men. Men have but to follow this road to realize the full fruition of their objects and purposes. Let those beware who would take the shorter road of disorder and revolution. The right road is the road of justice and orderly process.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE PRESIDENT APPEALS TO BITUMINOUS COAL MINERS AND PROPOSES A SOLUTION

DECEMBER 6, 1919

[The President's private secretary, Mr. Tumulty, and the Attorney General, Mr. Palmer, met officials of the United Mine Workers—who had been on strike since November 1—and submitted the following statement of the Government's position:]

I have watched with deep concern the developments in the bituminous coal strike and am convinced there is much confusion in the minds of the people generally, and possibly of both parties to this unfortunate controversy, as to the attitude and purposes of the Government in its handling of the situation.

The mine owners offered a wage increase of 20 per cent.,

conditioned, however, upon the price of coal being raised to an amount sufficient to cover this proposed increase of wages, which would have added at least $150,000,000 to the annual coal bill of the people. The Fuel Administrator, in the light of present information, has taken the position, and I think with entire justification, that the public is now paying as high prices for coal as it ought to be requested to pay, and that any wage increase made at this time ought to come out of the profits of the coal operators.

In reaching this conclusion, the Fuel Administrator expressed the personal opinion that the 14 per cent. increase in all mine wages is reasonable, because it would equalize the miners' wage on the average with the cost of living; but he made it perfectly clear that the operators and the miners are at liberty to agree upon a larger increase, provided the operators will pay it out of their profits so that the price of coal would remain the same.

The Secretary of Labour, in an effort at conciliation between the parties, expressed his personal opinion in favor of a larger increase. His efforts at conciliation failed, however, because the coal operators were unwilling to pay the scale he proposed, unless the Government would advance the price of coal to the public, and this the Government was unwilling to do.

The Fuel Administrator had also suggested that a tribunal be created in which the miners and operators would be equally represented, to consider further questions of wages and working conditions, as well as profits of operators and proper prices for coal. I shall, of course, be glad to aid in the formation of such a tribunal.

I understand the operators have generally agreed to absorb an increase of 14 per cent. in wages, so that the public would pay not to exceed the present price fixed by the Fuel Administrator, and thus a way is opened to secure the coal of which the people stand in need, if the miners will resume work on these terms pending a thorough investigation by an

impartial commission which may readjust both wages and prices.

By the acceptance of such a plan the miners are assured immediate steady employment at a substantial increase in wages and are further assured prompt investigation and action upon questions which are not now settled to their satisfaction. I must believe that with a clear understanding of these points they will promptly return to work. If, nevertheless, they persist in remaining on strike they will put themselves in an attitude of striking in order to force the Government to increase the price of coal to the public, so as to give a still further increase in wages at the time rather than allow the question of a further increase in wages to be dealt with in an orderly manner by a fairly constituted tribunal representing all parties interested.

No group of our people can justify such a position, and the miners owe it to themselves, their families, their fellow workmen in other industries and to their country to return to work.

Immediately upon a general resumption of mining I shall be glad to aid in the prompt formation of such a tribunal as I have indicated to make further inquiries into this whole matter and to review not only the reasonableness of the wages at which the miners start to work, but also the reasonableness of the government prices for coal. Such a tribunal should within sixty days make its report, which could be used as a basis for negotiating for a wage agreement. I must make it clear, however, that the Government cannot give its aid to any further investigation until there is a general resumption of work.

I ask every individual miner to give his personal thought to what I say. I hope he understands fully that he will be hurting his own interest and the interest of his family, and will be throwing countless other labouring men out of employment if he shall continue the present strike, and, further, that he will create an unnecessary and unfortunate

prejudice against organized labour which will be injurious to the best interests of working men everywhere.

WOODROW WILSON.

[The President's proposal was accepted by the miners' leaders on December 10, and the bituminous coal strike was called off.]

THE PRESIDENT APPOINTS A COMMISSION TO INVESTIGATE THE BITUMINOUS COAL INDUSTRY AND FIX THE BASIS OF A NEW WAGE AGREEMENT

DECEMBER 20, 1919

[A letter addressed to Henry M. Robinson, representing the public; similar letters were sent to Rembrandt Peale, a Pennsylvania coal operator, and John P. White, former president of the United Mine Workers.]

On October 6, 1917, with the official approval and sanction of the United States Fuel Administration, an agreement (since known as the "Washington wage agreement") was entered into between the operators and the union miners and mine workers of the so-called "central competitive bituminous coal fields," composed of Western Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana and Illinois, which provided for an increase in the production of bituminous coal and an increase in wages to the miners and mine workers from the then existing scale of compensation. The agreement contained the following clause:

"Subject to the next biennial convention of the United Mine Workers of America, the mine workers' representatives agree that the present contract be extended during the continuation of the war, and not to exceed two years from April 1, 1918."

Subsequently, on January 19, 1918, this agreement was approved by the convention of the International Union, United Mine Workers of America.

At the fourth biennial convention of the International Union, United Mine Workers of America, held in Cleveland, from September 9 to September 23, 1919, the so-called scale committee submitted a report recommending, among other things, that the convention demand a 60 per cent. increase applicable to all classifications of day labour and to all tonnage, yardage and dead work rates throughout the central competitive field; that all new wage agreements replacing existing agreements should be based on a six-hour workday from bank to bank, five days a week; the abolition of all automatic penalty clauses; that all contracts in the bituminous field should be declared to expire on November 1, 1919, and that "in the event a satisfactory wage agreement is not secured for the central competitive field before November 1, 1919, to replace the one now in effect, the international officers be authorized to and are hereby instructed to call a general strike of all bituminous miners and mine workers throughout the United States, the same to become effective November 1, 1919."

Subsequently conferences were held between representatives of the operators and of the miners, at which the miners' demands were submitted and declined on the part of the International Union of the United Mine Workers of America, which then issued so-called strike orders to all its local unions and members, requiring them to cease work in the mining of bituminous coal at midnight on Friday, October 31.

On October 15, 1919, the Secretary of Labour called a conference between the operators and miners of the bituminous mines in the central competitive field, which conference also resulted in a failure to reach an agreement. In a letter to Secretary Wilson, which was submitted to the conference, I said:

"If for any reason the miners and operators fail to come to a mutual understanding, the interests of the public are of such vital importance in connection with the production

of coal, that it is incumbent upon them to refer the matters in dispute to a board of arbitration for determination and to continue the operation of the mines pending the decision of the board."

Subsequently, on October 25, 1919, I issued a statement in which I said that a strike in the circumstances therein described "is not only unjustifiable, it is unlawful," and added:

"I express no opinion on the merits of the controversy. I have already suggested a plan by which a settlement may be reached and I hold myself in readiness, at the request of either or both sides, to appoint at once a tribunal to investigate all the facts, with a view to aiding in the earliest possible orderly settlement of the questions at issue between the coal operators and the coal miners, to the end that the just rights, not only of those interests, but also of the general public, may be fully protected."

Despite my earnest appeals that the men remain at work, the officers of the United Mine Workers of America rejected all the proposals for a peaceful and orderly adjustment and declared that the strike would go on. Accordingly, at my direction, the Attorney General filed a bill in equity in the United States District Court at Indianapolis, praying for an injunction to restrain the officers of the United Mine Workers of America from doing any act in furtherance of the strike. A restraining order was issued by the court, followed by a writ of temporary injunction on November 8, 1919, in which the defendants were commanded to cancel and revoke the strike orders theretofore issued. These strike orders were accordingly revoked in a form approved by the court, but the men did not return to work in sufficiently large number to bring about a production of coal anywhere approaching normal.

On December 6, 1919, I issued a statement in which I restated the Government's position, appealed to the miners to return to work, and renewed my suggestion that upon

the general resumption of mining operations a suitable tribunal would be erected for the purpose of investigating and adjusting the matters in controversy between the operators and the miners. This statement was submitted to a meeting of the officers of the International Union of the United Mine Workers of America, having authority to take action, which meeting adopted as its act a memorandum prepared by the Attorney General and approved by me, embodying the suggestions contained in my statement of December 6. I am informed, also, that the operators have generally agreed to the plan therein outlined. I inclose for your information a copy of my statement of December 6, 1919, and the memorandum just referred to.

There has now been a general resumption of operation in all parts of the bituminous coal fields sufficient to warrant the appointment of a commission such as is referred to in the memorandum of the Attorney General, and I have accordingly appointed you, Mr. Rembrandt Peale, a mine owner and operator in active business, and Mr. John P. White, a practical miner, as a commission with the powers and duties as set forth in the memorandum agreed to and adopted by the miners and operators who conducted all the prior negotiations. If a readjustment of the prices of coal shall be found necessary I shall be pleased to transfer to the commission, subject to its unanimous action, the powers heretofore vested in the Fuel Administrator for that purpose.

I am sure it is not necessary for me to call your attention to the tremendous importance of the work of this commission, or the great opportunity which it presents for lasting service to the coal industry and to the country. If the facts covering all the phases of the coal industry necessary to a proper adjustment of the matter submitted to you shall be investigated and reported to the public I am sure that your report, in addition to being accepted as the basis for a new wage agreement for the bituminous coal

miners, will promote the public welfare and make for a settled condition in the industry. No settlement can be had in this matter, permanent and lasting in its benefits, as affecting either the miners, the coal operators or the general public, unless the findings of this body are comprehensive in their character and embrace and guard at every point the public interest. To this end I deem it important that your conclusion should be reached by unanimous action. Upon your acceptance of this appointment I shall be pleased to call an early meeting of the commission in Washington, so that you may promptly lay out plans for your work. Sincerely yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

[The Coal Commission made its report on March 11, 1920, the majority recommending a 25 per cent. increase in wages with no change in hours or working conditions; and on March 31 a two-year agreement was signed by operators and miners on the basis of that award.]

PROCLAMATION RELINQUISHING GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF RAILROADS

DECEMBER 24, 1919

Whereas, in the exercise of authority committed to me by law, I have heretofore, through the Secretary of War, taken possession of, and have, through the Director General of Railroads, exercised control over certain railroads, systems of transportation and property appurtenant thereto or connected therewith, including systems of coastwise and inland transportation and property appurtenant thereto or controlled by said railroads or systems of transportation; including also terminals, terminal companies and terminal associations, sleeping and parlor cars, private cars and private car lines, elevators, warehouses, telegraph and telephone lines, and all other equipment and appurtenances

commonly used upon or operated as a part of such railroads and systems of transportation; and,

Whereas, I now deem it needful and desirable that all railroads, systems of transportation and property now under such Federal control be relinquished therefrom,

Now, therefore, under authority of Section 14 of the Federal Control Act, approved March 21, 1918, and of all other powers and provisions of law thereto me enabling, I, Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, do hereby relinquish from Federal control, effective the first day of March, 1920, at 12:01 A.M., all railroads, systems of transportation and property of whatever kind taken or held under such Federal control and not heretofore relinquished, and restore the same to the possession and control of their respective owners.

Walker D. Hines, Director General of Railroads, or his successor in office, is hereby authorized and directed, through such agent and agencies as he may determine, if in any manner not inconsistent with the provisions of said act of March 21, 1918, to adjust, settle and close all matters, including the making of agreements for compensation, and all questions and disputes of whatsoever nature arising out of or incident to Federal control, until otherwise provided by proclamation of the President or by act of Congress. And generally to do and perform as fully in all respects as the President is authorized to do, all and singular the acts and things necessary or proper in order to carry into effect this proclamation and the relinquishment of said railroads, systems of transportation and property.

For the purposes of accounting, and for all other purposes, this proclamation shall become effective on the first day of March, 1920, at 12:01 A.M.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done by the President, through Newton D. Baker, Secretary of War, in the District of Columbia, this 24th

day of December, the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and nineteen, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-fourth.

A Jackson Day Letter Criticizing the Senate's Attitude Toward the Peace Treaty

January 8, 1920

My Dear Mr. Chairman:

It is with the keenest regret that I find that I am to be deprived of the pleasure and privilege of joining you and other loyal Democrats who are to assemble to-night to celebrate Jackson Day and renew their vows of fidelity to the great principles of our party, the principles which must now fulfill the hopes not only of our own people but of the world.

The United States enjoyed the spiritual leadership of the world until the Senate of the United States failed to ratify the treaty by which the belligerent nations sought to effect the settlements for which they had fought throughout the war. It is inconceivable that at this supreme crisis and final turning point in the international relations of the whole world, when the results of the great war are by no means determined and are still questionable and dependent upon events which no man can foresee or count upon, the United States should withdraw from the concert of progressive and enlightened nations by which Germany was defeated and all similar governments (if the world be so unhappy as to contain any) warned of the certain consequences of any attempt of a like inequity, and yet that is the effect of the course the Senate of the United States has taken with regard to the Treaty of Versailles.

Germany is beaten, but we are still at war with her and

the old stage is reset for a repetition of the old plot. It is now ready for the resumption of the old offensive and defensive alliances which made settled peace impossible. It is now open again to every sort of intrigue. The old spies are free to resume their former abominable activities. They are again at liberty to make it impossible for governments to be sure what mischief is being worked among their own people, what internal disorders are being fomented. Without the covenant of the League of Nations there may be as many secret treaties as ever, to destroy the confidence of governments in each other, and their validity cannot be questioned.

None of the objects we professed to be fighting for has been secured or can be made certain of without this nation's ratification of the treaty and its entry into the covenant. This nation entered the great war to vindicate its own rights and to protect and preserve free government. It went into the war to see it through to the end, and the end has not yet come. It went into the war to make an end of militarism, to furnish guarantees to weak nations and to make a just and lasting peace.

It entered it with noble enthusiasms. Five of the leading belligerents have accepted the treaty and formal ratifications soon will be exchanged. The question is whether this country will enter, and enter whole-heartedly. If it does not do so, the United States and Germany will play a lone hand in the world. The maintenance of the peace of the world and the effective execution of the treaty depend upon the whole-hearted participation of the United States.

I am not stating it as a matter of power. The point is that the United States is the only nation which has sufficient moral force with the rest of the world to guarantee the substitution of discussion for war. If we keep out of this agreement, if we do not give our guarantees, then another attempt will be made to crush the new nations of Europe.

I do not believe that this is what the people of this country wish or will be satisfied with. Personally, I do not accept the action of the Senate of the United States as the decision of the nation. I have asserted from the first that the overwhelming majority of the people of this country desire the ratification of the treaty, and my impression to that effect has recently been confirmed by the unmistakable evidences of public opinion given during my visit to seventeen of the States.

I have endeavored to make it plain that if the Senate wishes to say what the undoubted meaning of the League is, I shall have no objection. There can be no reasonable objection to interpretations accompanying the act of ratification itself. But when the treaty is acted upon, I must know whether it means that we have ratified or rejected it. We cannot rewrite this treaty. We must take it without changes which alter its meaning, or leave it, and then, after the rest of the world has signed it, we must face the unthinkable task of making another and separate kind of treaty with Germany. But no mere assertions with regard to the wish and opinion of the country are credited.

If there is any doubt as to what the people of the country think on this vital matter, the clear and single way out is to submit it for determination at the next election to the voters of the nation, to give the next election the form of a great and solemn referendum, a referendum as to the part the United States is to play in completing the settlements of the war and in the prevention in the future of such outrages as Germany attempted to perpetrate.

We have no moral right to refuse now to take part in the execution and administration of these settlements than we had to refuse to take part in the fighting of the last few weeks of the war which brought victory and made it possible to dictate to Germany what the settlements should be. Our fidelity to our associates in the war is in question, and the whole future of mankind. It will be heartening to the

whole world to know the attitude and purpose of the people of the United States.

I spoke just now of the spiritual leadership of the United States, thinking of international affairs. But there is another spiritual leadership which is open to us and which we can assume. The world has been made safe for democracy, but democracy has not been finally vindicated. All sorts of crime are being committed in its name, all sorts of preposterous perversions of its doctrines and practices are being attempted. This, in my judgment, is to be the great privilege of the democracy of the United States—to show that it can lead the way in the solution of the great social and industrial problems of our time and lead the way to a happy settled order of life as well as to political liberty.

The program for this achievement we must attempt to formulate, and in carrying it out we shall do more than can be done in any other way to sweep out of existence the tyrannous and arbitrary forms of power which are now masquerading under the name of popular government.

Whenever we look back to Andrew Jackson we should draw fresh inspiration from his character and example. His mind grasped with such a splendid definiteness and firmness the principle of national authority and national action. He was so indomitable in his purpose to give reality to the principles of the government that this is a very fortunate time to recall his career and to renew our vows of faithfulness to the principles and the pure practices of democracy. I rejoice to join you in this renewal of faith and purpose. I hope that the whole evening may be of the happiest results as regards the fortunes of our party and the nation. With cordial regard,

Sincerely yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

The President Calls the First Meeting of the Council of the League of Nations

January 13, 1920

[Telegram addressed to the Governments of Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, Belgium, Brazil and Spain.]

In compliance with Article V of the covenant of the League of Nations, which went into effect at the same time as the Treaty of Versailles of June 28, 1919, of which it is a part, the President of the United States, acting on behalf of those nations which have deposited their instruments of ratification in Paris as certified in a proces verbal drawn up by the French Government, dated January 10, 1920, has the honor to inform the Government of Great Britain that the first meeting of the Council of the League of Nations will be held in Paris at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on Friday, January 16, at 10:30 A.M.

The President ventures to hope that the Government of Great Britain will be in a position to send a representative to this first meeting. He feels that it is unnecessary for him to point out the deep significance attached to this meeting or the importance which it must assume in the eyes of the world.

It will mark the beginning of a new era in international cooperation and the first great step toward the ideal concert of nations. It will bring the League of Nations into being as a living force devoted to the task of assisting the peoples of all countries in their desire for peace, prosperity and happiness. The President is convinced that its progress will accord with the noble purposes to which it is dedicated.

A Letter to Senator Hitchcock, Accepting His Peace Treaty Reservations

January 26, 1920

[Although the peace treaty had been rejected by the Senate on November 19, 1919, neither the Republican pro-leaguers nor the Democratic anti-reservationists had seemed satisfied. Not long after the Sixty-sixth Congress assembled in December, the treaty and the League covenant were subjects of occasional debate, and by February they were once more monopolizing the attention of the Senate. On February 9, 1920, Mr. Lodge (Rep., Mass.) succeeded in obtaining the Senate's consent to consider the treaty a second time. Meanwhile, however, Democratic and Republican leaders had been endeavoring to reach a compromise, and Senator Hitchcock (Dem., Neb.) had proposed substitutes for the Lodge reservations.]

My Dear Senator Hitchcock:

I have greatly appreciated your thoughtful kindness in keeping me informed concerning the conferences you and some of your colleagues have had with spokesmen of the Republican Party concerning the possibility of ratification of the treaty of peace, and send this line in special appreciative acknowledgment of your letter of the 22d. I return the clipping you were kind enough to enclose.

To the substance of it I, of course, adhere. I am bound to, like yourself. I am solemnly sworn to obey and maintain the Constitution of the United States. But I think the form of it very unfortunate. Any reservation or resolution stating that "The United States assumes no obligation under such and such an article unless or except" would, I am sure, chill our relationship with the nations with which we expect to be associated in the great enterprise of maintaining the world's peace.

That association must in any case, my dear Senator, involve very serious and far-reaching implications of honor and duty, which I am sure we shall never in fact be desirous of ignoring. It is the more important not to create the impression that we are trying to escape obligations.

But I realize that negative criticism is not all that is called for in so serious a matter. I am happy to be able to add, therefore, that I have once more gone over the reservations proposed by yourself, the copy of which I return herewith, and am glad to say that I can accept them as they stand.

I have never seen the slightest reason to doubt the good faith of our associates in the war, nor ever had the slightest reason to fear that any nation would seek to enlarge our obligations under the covenant of the League of Nations, or seek to commit us to lines of action which, under our Constitution, only the Congress of the United States can in the last analysis decide.

May I suggest that with regard to the possible withdrawal of the United States it would be wise to give to the President the right to act upon a resolution of Congress in the matter of withdrawal? In other words, it would seem to be permissible and advisable that any resolution giving notice of withdrawal should be a joint rather than a concurrent resolution.

I doubt whether the President can be deprived of his veto power under the Constitution, even with his own consent. The use of a joint resolution would permit the President, who is, of course, charged by the Constitution with the conduct of foreign policy, to merely exercise a voice in saying whether so important a step as withdrawal from the League of Nations should be accomplished by a majority or by a two-thirds vote.

The Constitution itself providing that the legislative body was to be consulted in treaty-making and having prescribed a two-thirds vote in such cases, it seems to me that there should be no unnecessary departure from the method there indicated.

I see no objection to a frank statement that the United States can accept a mandate with regard to any territory under Article XIII, Part 1, or any other provision of the

treaty of peace, only by the direct authority and action of the Congress of the United States.

I hope, my dear Senator, that you will never hesitate to call upon me for any assistance that I can render in this or any other public matter.

Cordially and sincerely yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

[The Senate became deadlocked a second time, for Mr. Hitchcock—the recognized spokesman for President Wilson—on February 11 refused to accept the bi-partisan committee reservations and the Republicans in turn refused to accept his. Sixteen Democrats joined with the Republicans to adopt the Lodge reservation on Article X, 59 for and 26 against; but when the vote came on ratification of the treaty itself on March 19, 1920, there were only 49 votes in favor and 35 against. The treaty, therefore, failed a second time to obtain the necessary two-thirds majority.]

NOTES TO FRANCE AND GREAT BRITAIN REGARDING FIUME AND THE ITALY-JUGOSLAVIA BOUNDARY

FEBRUARY 9-MARCH 4, 1920

[President Wilson, in the following cablegram dated February 9, 1920, addressed to the American Ambassador at Paris, declines to accept new British and French proposals of January 14. If acceptance of British-French-American proposals of December 9, 1919, can not be obtained from Italy, the President declares in this cablegram that he must take under consideration the withdrawal of the treaty with Germany from the Senate and permit the settlement of European questions to be established by the associated governments.]

The President has carefully considered the joint cablegram addressed to this Government by the French and British Prime Ministers and communicated by the American Ambassador in Paris, in regard to the negotiations on the Adriatic question. The President notes with satisfaction that the French, British, and Japanese Governments have never had the intention of proceeding to a definite settlement of this question except in consultation with the American Government. The President was particularly happy to

receive this assurance as he understood that Monsieur Clemenceau and Mr. Lloyd-George, in agreement with Signor Nitti, had decided upon a solution of the Adriatic question which included provisions previously rejected by the American Government, and had called upon the Jugoslav representatives to accept this solution, on pain of having the Treaty of London enforced in case of rejection. The President is glad to feel that the associates of this Government would not consent to embarrass it by placing it in the necessity of refusing adhesion to a settlement which in form would be an agreement by both parties to the controversy, but which in fact would not have that great merit if one party was forced to submit to material injustice by threats of still greater calamities in default of submission.

The President fully shares the view of the French and British Governments that the future of the world largely depends upon the right solution of this question, but he can not believe that a solution containing provisions which have already received the well-merited condemnation of the French and British Governments can in any sense be regarded as right. Neither can he share the opinion of the French and British Governments that the proposals contained in their memorandum delivered to the Jugoslav representatives on January 14th leave untouched practically every important point of the joint memorandum of the French, British, and American Governments of December 9, 1919, and that "only two features undergo alterations, and both these alterations are to the positive advantage of Jugoslavia." On the contrary, the President is of the opinion that the proposal of December 9th has been profoundly altered to the advantage of improper Italian objectives, to the serious injury of the Jugoslav people, and to the peril of world peace. The view that very positive advantages have been conceded to Italy would appear to be borne out by the fact that the Italian Government rejected the proposal of December 9th and accepted that of January 14th.

The memorandum of December 9th rejected the device of connecting Fiume with Italy by a narrow strip of coast territory as quite unworkable in practice, and as involving extraordinary complexities as regards customs control, coast-guard services, and cognate matters in a territory of such unusual configuration. The French and British Governments, in association with the American Government, expressed the opinion that "the plan appears to run counter to every consideration of geography, economics, and territorial convenience." The American Government notes that this annexation of Jugoslav territory by Italy is nevertheless agreed to by the memorandum of January 14th.

The memorandum of December 9th rejected Italy's demand for the annexation of all of Istria, on the solid ground that neither strategic nor economic considerations could justify such annexation, and that there remained nothing in defense of the proposition save Italy's desire for more territory admittedly inhabited by Jugoslavs. The French and British Governments then expressed their cordial approval of the way in which the President had met every successive Italian demand for the absorption in Italy of territories inhabited by peoples not Italian and not in favor of being absorbed, and joined in the opinion that, "it is neither just nor expedient to annex as the spoils of war territories inhabited by an alien race." Yet this unjust and inexpedient annexation of all of Istria is provided for in the memorandum of January 14th.

The memorandum of December 9th carefully excluded every form of Italian sovereignty over Fiume. The American Government can not avoid the conclusion that the memorandum of January 14th opens the way for Italian control of Fiume's foreign affairs, thus introducing a measure of Italian sovereignty over, and Italian intervention in, the only practicable port of a neighboring people; and, taken in conjunction with the extension of Italian territory to the gates of Fiume, paves the way for possible future annexa-

tion of the port by Italy, in contradiction of compelling considerations of equity and right.

The memorandum of December 9th afforded proper protection to the vital railway connecting Fiume northward with the interior. The memorandum of January 14th establishes Italy in dominating military positions close to the railway at a number of critical points.

The memorandum of December 9th maintained in large measure the unity of the Albanian state. That of January 14th partitions the Albanian people, against their vehement protests, among three different alien powers.

These and other provisions of the memorandum of January 14th, negotiated without the knowledge or approval of the American Government, change the whole face of the Adriatic settlement, and, in the eyes of this Government, render it unworkable and rob it of that measure of justice which is essential if this Government is to cooperate in maintaining its terms. The fact that the Jugoslav representatives might feel forced to accept, in the face of the alternative of the Treaty of London, a solution which appears to this Government so unfair in principle and so unworkable in practice, would not in any degree alter the conviction of this Government that it can not give its assent to a settlement which both in the terms of its provisions and in the methods of its enforcement constitutes a positive denial of the principles for which America entered the war.

The matter would wear a very different aspect if there were any real divergence of opinion as to what constitutes a just settlement of the Adriatic issue. Happily no such divergence exists. The opinions of the French, British, and Americans as to a just and equitable territorial arrangement at the head of the Adriatic Sea were strikingly harmonious. Italy's unjust demands had been condemned by the French and British Governments in terms no less severe than those employed by the American Government. Certainly the French and British Governments will yield nothing to their

American associate as regards the earnestness with which they have sought to convince the Italian Government that fulfillment of its demands would be contrary to Italy's own best interests, opposed to the spirit of justice in international dealings and fraught with danger to the peace of Europe. In particular, the French and British Governments have opposed Italy's demands for specific advantages which it is now proposed to yield to her by the memorandum of January 14th, and have joined in informing the Italian Government that the concessions previously made "afford to Italy full satisfaction of her historic national aspirations based on the desire to unite the Italian race, give her the absolute strategic control of the Adriatic and offer her complete guarantees against whatever aggressions she might fear in the future from her Jugoslav neighbors."

While there is thus substantial agreement as to the injustice and inexpediency of Italy's claims, there is a difference of opinion as to how firmly Italy's friends should resist her importunate demands for alien territories to which she can present no valid title. It has seemed to the President that French and British associates of the American Government, in order to prevent the development of possibly dangerous complications in the Adriatic region, have felt constrained to go very far in yielding to demands which they have long opposed as unjust. The American Government, while no less generous in its desire to accord to Italy every advantage to which she could offer any proper claims, feels that it can not sacrifice the principles for which it entered the war to gratify the improper ambitions of one of its associates or to purchase a temporary appearance of calm in the Adriatic at the price of a future world conflagration. It is unwilling to recognize either an unjust settlement based on a secret treaty the terms of which are inconsistent with the New World conditions, or an unjust settlement arrived at by employing that secret treaty as an instrument of coercion. It would welcome any solution of the problem

based on a free and unprejudiced consideration of the merits of the controversy, or on terms which the disinterested Great Powers agreed to be just and equable. Italy, however, has repeatedly rejected such solutions. This Government can not accept a settlement the terms of which have been admitted to be unwise and unjust, but which it is proposed to grant to Italy in view of her persistent refusal to accept any wise and just solution.

It is a time to speak with the utmost frankness. The Adriatic issue as it now presents itself raises the fundamental question as to whether the American Government can on any terms cooperate with its European associates in the great work of maintaining the peace of the world by removing the primary causes of war. This Government does not doubt its ability to reach amicable understandings with the Associated Governments as to what constitutes equity and justice in international dealings, for differences of opinion as to the best methods of applying just principles have never obscured the vital fact that in the main the several Governments have entertained the same fundamental conception of what those principles are. But if substantial agreement on what is just and reasonable is not to determine international issues; if the country possessing the most endurance in pressing its demands rather than the country armed with a just cause is to gain the support of the powers; if forcible seizure of coveted areas is to be permitted and condoned, and is to receive ultimate justification by creating a situation so difficult that decision favorable to the aggressor is deemed a practical necessity; if deliberately incited ambition is, under the name of national sentiment, to be rewarded at the expense of the small and the weak; if, in a word, the old order of things which brought so many evils on the world is still to prevail, then the time is not yet come when this Government can enter a concert of powers the very existence of which must depend upon a new spirit and a new order. The American people

are willing to share in such high enterprise, but many among them are fearful lest they become entangled in international policies and committed to international obligations foreign alike to their ideals and their traditions. To commit them to such a policy as that embodied in the latest Adriatic proposals, and to obligate them to maintain injustice as against the claims of justice, would be to provide the most solid ground for such fears. This Government can undertake no such grave responsibility.

The President desires to say that if it does not appear feasible to secure acceptance of the just and generous concessions offered by the British, French, and American Governments to Italy in the joint memorandum of those powers of December 9, 1919, which the President has already clearly stated to be the maximum concession that the Government of the United States can offer, the President desires to say that he must take under serious consideration the withdrawal of the treaty with Germany and the agreement between the United States and France of June 28, 1919, which are now before the Senate and permitting the terms of the European settlement to be independently established and enforced by the Associated Governments.

[France and Great Britain replied to the foregoing communication on February 17, stating that they "do not find it altogether easy to understand the steps by which the Government of the United States has arrived at its present attitude." They state in detail the reasons which prompted the new proposals, "the natural outcome of the policy of the joint memorandum of December 9"—to which the United States was a party. President Wilson thereupon sent a second cablegram, dated February 24, as follows:]

The joint memorandum of February 17 of the Prime Ministers of France and Great Britain has received the careful and earnest consideration of the President. He has no desire whatever to criticize the attitude of the Governments of France and Great Britain concerning the Adriatic settlement, but feels that in the present circumstances he

has no choice but to maintain the position he has all along taken as regards that settlement. He believes it to be the central principle fought for in the war that no government or group of governments has the right to dispose of the territory or to determine the political allegiance of any free people. The five great powers, though the Government of the United States constitutes one of them, have in his conviction no more right than had the Austrian Government to dispose of the free Jugoslavic peoples without the free consent and cooperation of those peoples. The President's position is that the powers associated against Germany gave final and irrefutable proof of their sincerity in the war by writing into the Treaty of Versailles Article X of the Covenant of the League of Nations, which constitutes an assurance that all the great powers have done what they have compelled Germany to do—have foregone all territorial aggression and all interference with the free political self-determination of the peoples of the world. With this principle lived up to, permanent peace is secured and the supreme object of the recent conflict has been achieved. Justice and self-determination have been substituted for aggression and political dictation. Without it, there is no security for any nation that conscientiously adheres to a non-militaristic policy. The object of the war, as the Government of the United States understands it, was to free Europe from that cloud of anxiety which had hung over it for generations because of the constant threat of the use of military force by one of the most powerful governments of the continent, and the President feels it important to say again that in the opinion of the American Government the terms of the peace settlement must continue to be formulated upon the basis of the principles for which America entered the war. It is in a spirit of cooperation, therefore, and of desire for mutual understanding that the President reviews the various considerations which the French and British Prime Ministers have emphasized in their memo-

randum of February 17. He is confident that they will not mistake his motives in undertaking to make plain what he feels to be the necessary conclusions from their statements.

The President notes that the objections of the Italians and Jugoslavs were made the basis for discarding the project of the free state of Fiume. It would seem to follow, therefore, that the joint consent of these two powers should have been required for the substitute project. The consent of Italy has been obtained. He does not find, however, that the Jugoslavs have also expressed a willingness to accept the substitute plan. Are they to be required now to accept a proposal which is more unsatisfactory because they have raised objections to the solution proposed by the British, French, and American Governments in the memorandum of December 9? The President would, of course, make no objection to a settlement mutually agreeable to Italy and Jugoslavia regarding their common frontier in the Fiume region, provided that such an agreement is not made on the basis of compensations elsewhere at the expense of nationals of a third power. His willingness to accept such proposed joint agreement of Italy and Jugoslavia is based on the fact that only their own nationals are involved. In consequence, the results of direct negotiations of the two interested powers would fall within the scope of the principle of self-determination. Failing in this, both parties should be willing to accept a decision of the Governments of Great Britain, France, and the United States.

The British and French Governments appear to find in the President's suggestion that the latest proposals would pave the way for the annexation of the city of Fiume, an implication that the guaranty of the League of Nations is worthless and that the Italian Government does not intend to abide by a treaty into which it has entered. The President can not but regard this implication as without basis and as contrary to his thought. In his view the proposal to connect Fiume with Italy by a narrow strip of coast ter-

ritory is quite impracticable. As he has already said, it involves extraordinary complexities in customs control, coast-guard services, and other related matters, and he is unable to detach himself from the previous views of the British and French Governments, as expressed jointly with the American Government in the memorandum of December 9, that "the plan appears to run counter to every consideration of geography, economics, and territorial convenience." He further believes that to have Italian territory join Fiume would be to invite strife out of which annexation might issue. Therefore, in undertaking to shape the solution so as to prevent this he is acting on the principle that each part of the final settlement should be based upon the essential justice of that particular case. This was one of the principles adopted by the Allied and Associated Powers as a basis for treaty making. To it has been added the provisions of the League of Nations, but it has never been the policy of either this Government or its associates to invoke the League of Nations as a guarantee that a bad settlement shall not become worse. The sum of such actions would of necessity destroy faith in the League and eventually the League itself.

The President notes with satisfaction that the Governments of Great Britain and France will not lose sight of the future interests and well-being of the Albanian peoples. The American Government quite understands that the threefold division of Albania in the British-French agreement might be most acceptable to the Jugoslav Government, but it is just as vigorously opposed to injuring the Albanian people for the benefit of Jugoslavia as it is opposed to injuring the Jugoslav people for the benefit of Italy. It believes that the differences between the Christian and Mohammedan populations will be increased by putting the two sections under the control of nations of unlike language, government, and economic strength. Moreover, one part would be administered by the Italian Government,

which is represented on the Council of the League, the other part by the Jugoslav Government, which has no such representation. Therefore, to alter or withdraw the mandate at some future time would be well-nigh impossible.

Regarding the Treaty of London, the French and British Prime Ministers will appreciate that the American Government must hesitate to speak with assurance, since it is a matter in which the French and British Governments can alone judge their obligations and determine their policies. But the President feels that it is not improper to recall a few of the arguments which have already been advanced against this treaty, namely, the dissolution of Austria-Hungary, the secret character of the treaty, and its opposition to the principles unanimously accepted as the basis for making peace.

In addition he desires to submit certain further considerations. In the northern Italian frontiers agreements have already been reached which depart from the Treaty of London line and which were made with the understanding that negotiations were proceeding on quite a new basis. It has been no secret that the parties to the treaty did not themselves now desire it and that they have thus far refrained from putting its provisions into effect. In mutually disregarding their secret treaty commitments, the parties to the treaty have recognized the change in circumstances that has taken place in the interval between the signing of the secret treaty and its proposed execution at the present time. For nearly eight months discussion of the Adriatic problem has proceeded on the assumption that a better basis for an understanding could be found than those provided by the Treaty of London. The greater part of the resulting proposals have already received Italy's assent. These proposals in some cases affected territory beyond the Treaty of London line, as in the Tarvis and Sexton Valleys; in others, the territory fell short of the Treaty of London line, as in the case of the islands of Lussin, Unie, Lissa,

and Pelagosa—to mention only a few of the many proposals upon which tentative agreements have long been reached and which would be upset by an application of the treaty at this late day.

The coupling of the Treaty of London as an obligatory alternative to the Adriatic settlement proposed on January 14 came as a surprise to the American Government, because this Government had already by the agreement of December 9 entered into a distinct understanding with the British and French Governments regarding the basis of a settlement of the question. By their action of January 14 the Government of the United States was confronted with a definite solution, to which was added on January 20 a threat to fall back upon the terms of the Treaty of London. This course was followed without any attempt to seek the views of this Government or to provide such opportunity of discussion as was easily arranged in many other matters dealt with in the same period.

The President notes that the memorandum of February 17 refers to the difficulty of reconciling ethnographic with other considerations in making territorial adjustments, and cites the inclusion of 3,000,000 Germans in Czechoslovakia and more than 3,000,000 Ruthenes in Poland as examples of necessary modifications of ethnographic frontiers. He feels compelled to observe that this is a line of reasoning which the Italian representatives have advanced during the course of negotiations but which the British and French have hitherto found themselves unable to accept. There were cases where for sufficient geographical and economic reasons slight deflections of the ethnographical frontier were sanctioned by the Conference, and the American Government believes that if Italy would consent to apply the same principles in Istria and Dalmatia, the Adriatic question would not exist.

The American Government heartily subscribes to the sentiments expressed by the Governments of Great Britain

and France regarding Italy's participation in the war. It fully appreciates the vital consequences of her participation and is profoundly grateful for her heroic sacrifices. These sentiments have been repeatedly expressed by the American Government. But such considerations can not be made the reason for unjust settlements which will be provocative of future wars. A course thus determined would be short sighted and not in accord with the terrible sacrifices of the entire world, which can be justified and ennobled only by leading finally to settlements in keeping with the principles for which the war was fought. The President asks that the Prime Ministers of France, Great Britain, and Italy will read his determination in the Adriatic matter in the light of these principles and settlements and will realize that standing upon such a foundation of principle he must of necessity maintain the position which he arrived at after months of earnest consideration. He confidently counts upon their cooperation in this effort on his part to maintain for the Allied and Associated Powers that direction of affairs which was initiated by the victory over Germany and the Peace Conference at Paris.

POLK.

[The Prime Ministers of France and Great Britain made a joint reply dated February 26. The President thereupon sent a third note, as follows:]

The President desires to express his sincere and cordial interest in the response of the French and British Prime Ministers received on February 27. He notes with satisfaction their unaltered desire to reach "an equitable solution in conformity alike with the principles of the Peace Conference and of the legitimate though conflicting aspirations of the Italian and Jugoslav peoples." He further welcomes their expressed intention, regarding certain essential points, "to urge upon the Governments interested that they should bring their desires into line with the American point of view."

The President is surprised, however, that they should find in the statement of his own willingness to leave to the joint agreement of Italy and Jugoslavia the settlement of "their common frontiers in the Fiume region" any ground for suggesting the withdrawal of the joint memorandum of December 9. In this he could not possibly join. The memorandum represents deliberate and disinterested judgment after months of earnest discussion. It constituted more than a mere exchange of views; it was a statement of principles and a recapitulation of the chief points upon which agreement had been reached. There was thus afforded a summary review of these points of agreement of the French, British, and American Governments, and the memorandum should remain as it was intended to be, the basis of reference representing the combined opinion of these Governments.

In referring to the "common frontier in the Fiume region," the President had in mind the express desire of the two interested Governments to abandon the project of the free state of Fiume as defined in the memorandum of December 9. If, as he understands, the Government of Italy and the Government of the Serb-Croat-Slovene State prefer to abandon the so-called buffer state containing an overwhelming majority of Jugoslavs, and desire to limit the proposed free state to the *corpus separatum* of Fiume, placing the sovereignty in the League of Nations without either Italian or Jugoslav control, then the Government of the United States is prepared to accept this proposal and is willing under such circumstances to leave the determination of the common frontier to Italy and Jugoslavia. In this connection the President desires to reiterate that he would gladly approve a mutual agreement between the Italian and Jugoslav Governments reached without prejudice to the territorial or other interests of any third nation. But Albanian questions should not be included in the proposed joint discussion of Italy and Jugoslavia, and the President

must reaffirm that he can not possibly approve any plan which assigns to Jugoslavia in the northern districts of Albania territorial compensation for what she is deprived of elsewhere. Concerning the economic outlets for Jugoslavia in the region of Scutari, suggested in the note under reply, the President desires to refer to the memorandum of December 9 as making adequate provisions to meet the needs of Jugoslavia.

Regarding the character and applicability of the Treaty of London, the President is led to speak with less reserve on account of the frank observations of the French and British Prime Ministers. He is unable to find in the "exigencies of military strategy" sufficient warrant for exercising secrecy with a Government which was intimately associated with the signatories of the Treaty of London in the gigantic task of defending human freedom and which was being called upon for unlimited assistance and for untold treasure. The definite and well-accepted policy of the American Government throughout its participation in the deliberations of the Peace Conference was that it did not consider itself bound by secret treaties of which it had previously not known the existence. Where the provisions of such treaties were just and reasonable, the United States was willing to respect them. But the French and British Prime Ministers will of course not expect the Government of the United States to approve the execution of the terms of the Treaty of London, except in so far as that Government may be convinced that those terms are intrinsically just and are consistent with the maintenance of peace and settled order in southeastern Europe.

The absence of an American representative with plenary power is to be regretted and may have been a source of inconvenience, but the President can recall several instances where decisions in the Supreme Council were delayed while the British and French representatives sought the views of their Governments, and he is convinced that time would

have been saved and many misunderstandings avoided if, before actual decisions had been reached and communicated to the Italian and Jugoslav delegations, this Government had been given sufficient indication of the fact that the British and French Governments intended radically to depart from the memorandum of December 9.

In conclusion the President desires to express his concurrence in the view of the British and French Prime Ministers that a speedy settlement of the Adriatic question is of utmost importance. But he can not accept as just the implied suggestion of his responsibility for the failure to reach a solution. He has merely adhered to the provisions of a settlement which the French and British Governments recognized as equitable in the joint memorandum of December 9, and has declined to approve a new settlement negotiated without the knowledge or approval of the American Government, which was unacceptable to one of the interested Governments and which in his opinion was in direct contradiction of the principles for the defense of which America entered the war. These views he has fully explained in his note of February 10, and he ventures to express the earnest hope that the Allied Governments will not find it necessary to decide on a course which the American Government in accordance with its reiterated statements will be unable to follow.

POLK.

NOTE TO THE FRENCH AMBASSADOR REGARDING PEACE TERMS FOR TURKEY AND THE FUTURE OF CONSTANTINOPLE

MARCH 24, 1920

I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your excellency's note of March 12, relative to the conferences regarding the peace treaty with Turkey and the present status of the negotiations between the principal Allied powers, and in

reply to inform you that the President does not deem it advisable in the present circumstances that the United States be represented by a plenipotentiary at the conference. The President feels, however, that, as this government is vitally interested in the future peace of the world, it should frankly express its views on the proposed solutions of the difficult questions connected with the Turkish treaty. While it is true that the United States of America was not at war with Turkey, yet it was at war with the principal allies of that country and contributed to the defeat of those allies, and, therefore, to the defeat of the Turkish government. For that reason, too, it is believed that it is the duty of this government to make known its views and urge a solution which will be both just and lasting.

The government of the United States understands the strength of the arguments for the retention of the Turks at Constantinople, but believes that the arguments against it are far stronger and contain certain imperative elements which it would not seem possible to ignore. It was the often expressed intention of the Allies that the anomaly of the Turks in Europe should cease, and it cannot be believed that the feelings of the Mahometan people, who not only witnessed the defeat of the Turkish power without protest but even materially assisted in the defeat, will now so resent the expulsion of the Turkish government as to make a complete reversal of policy on the part of the great powers desirable or necessary.

As to the line given as the southern frontier of Turkey, it is assumed that this boundary is meant to be the ethnological frontier of the Arab people, in which case, it is suggested, certain rectifications would seem necessary. If, however, other considerations entered into the choice of this line, this government without any intention to criticize, would appreciate being furnished with the arguments dictating such a choice.

The government of the United States notes with pleasure

that provision is made for Russian representation on the International Council, which it is proposed shall be established for the government of Constantinople and the Straits. This government is convinced that no arrangement that is now made concerning the government and control of Constantinople and the Straits can have any elements of permanency unless the vital interests of Russia in those problems are carefully provided for and protected, and unless it is understood that Russia, when it has a government recognized by the civilized world, may assert its right to be heard in regard to the decisions now made.

It is noted with pleasure that the questions of passage of warships and the régime of the Straits in war time are still under advisement, as this government is convinced that no final decision should or can be made without the consent of Russia.

As for Thrace, it would seem right that that part of east Thrace, which is outside of the zone reserved for Constantinople, should become part of the kingdom of Greece, with the exception of the northern part of that province. As this, the northern part, is clearly Bulgarian in population, justice and fair dealing demand that the cities of Adrianople and Kirk Kilisseh and the surrounding territory should become part of Bulgaria. Not only is the claim of Bulgaria worthy of most serious consideration on ethnic and historical grounds, but it would also seem that Bulgaria is entitled to have its claim to this territory favorably considered in view of its having been compelled to surrender purely Bulgarian territory and many thousands of Bulgars on its western boundary on no other grounds than the rather doubtful grounds of securing a strategic frontier for Serbia.

In connection with the proposed preferential right of the three great Mediterranean powers to furnish advisers and instructors in certain zones, this government feels that it is necessary for it to have more information as to the reason

and purpose of such a plan before it can express an intelligent opinion.

There can be no question as to the genuine interest of this government in the plans for Armenia, and the government of the United States is convinced that the civilized world demands and expects the most liberal treatment for that unfortunate country. Its boundaries should be drawn in such a way as to recognize all the legitimate claims of the Armenian people, and particularly to give them easy and unencumbered access to the sea. While unaware of the considerations governing the decision reached by the Supreme Council, it is felt that special rights over Lazistan would partially assure to Armenia that access to the sea indispensable to its existence. It is hoped that, taking into consideration the fact that Trebizond has always been the terminus of the trade route across Armenia and that Mr. Venizelos on behalf of the Greeks of that region has expressed their preference for connection with Armenia rather than Turkey, the powers will be willing to grant Trebizond to Armenia.

In regard to the relinquishment by Turkey of her rights to Mesopotamia, Arabia, Palestine, Syria and the islands, this government suggests that the method resorted to in the case of Austria be adopted, namely—that Turkey should place these provinces in the hands of the great powers, to be disposed of as those powers may determine.

In regard to the arrangements for Smyrna, this government is not in a position to express an opinion, as the question is too important to be passed on with the limited information this government has as to the exact arrangement that is contemplated and the reasons for the same.

The government of the United States can quite understand the difficulties that have confronted the Supreme Council in dealing with the economic questions that present themselves for settlement in connection with this treaty. It is easy to see that the problems are complex and fruitful

of misunderstanding because of the conflicting interests involved, but this government has every confidence that the problems will be dealt with in a spirit of fairness and with scrupulous regard for the commercial interests of victor, vanquished and neutral.

It is evident that there is yet much to be done before a comprehensive plan can be worked out, and this government will welcome further information on the subject of the economic clauses of this treaty. Incidentally, the plan that has apparently been worked out by the Supreme Council in connection with continuation of concessions granted to aliens and giving the right to revise or cancel concessions on payment of indemnity, referred to in the eighth paragraph of your excellency's note, has grave possibilities and would seem to require careful elucidation.

Let me say in conclusion that it is the understanding of the government of the United States that whatever territorial changes or arrangements may be made in the former Ottoman Empire, such changes or arrangements will in no way place American citizens or corporations, or the citizens or corporations of any other country, in a less favorable situation than the citizens or corporations of any power party to this treaty.

COLBY.

MESSAGE TO OREGON DEMOCRATS ON THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS AS A CAMPAIGN ISSUE

[A telegram to G. E. Hamaker, Chairman of the Multnomah County Democratic Central Committee.]

MAY 9, 1920

I think it imperative that the party should at once proclaim itself the uncompromising champion of the nation's honor and the advocate of everything that the United States can do in the service of humanity; that it should therefore

indorse and support the Versailles Treaty and condemn the Lodge reservations as utterly inconsistent with the nation's honor and destructive of the world leadership which it had established, and which all the free peoples of the world, including the great Powers themselves, had shown themselves ready to welcome.

It is time that the party should proudly avow that it means to try, without flinching or turning at any time away from the path for reasons of expediency, to apply moral and Christian principles to the problems of the world. It is trying to accomplish social, political and international reforms and is not daunted by any of the difficulties it has to contend with. Let us prove to our late associates in the war that at any rate the great majority party of the nation, the party which expresses the true hopes and purposes of the people of the country, intends to keep faith with them in peace as well as in war. They gave their treasure, their best blood and everything that they valued in order not merely to beat Germany, but to effect a settlement and bring about arrangements of peace which they have now tried to formulate in the Treaty of Versailles. They are entitled to our support in this settlement and in the arrangements for which they have striven.

The League of Nations is the hope of the world. As a basis for the armistice I was authorized by all the great fighting nations to say to the enemy that it was our object in proposing peace to establish a general association of nations under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small States alike, and the covenant of the League of Nations is the deliberate embodiment of that purpose in the Treaty of Peace.

The chief motives which led us to enter the war will be defeated unless that covenant is ratified and acted upon with vigor. We cannot in honor whittle it down or weaken it as the Republican leaders of the Senate have proposed to do.

If we are to exercise the kind of leadership to which the founders of the Republic looked forward and which they depended upon their successors to establish, we must do this thing with courage and unalterable determination. They expected the United States to be always the leaders in the defense of liberty and ordered peace throughout the world, and we are unworthy to call ourselves their successors unless we fulfill the great purpose they entertained and proclaimed.

The true Americanism, the only true Americanism, is that which puts America at the front of free nations and redeems the great promises which we made the world when we entered the war, which was fought, not for the advantage of any single nation or group of nations, but for the salvation of all. It is in this way we shall redeem the sacred blood that was shed and make America the force she should be in the counsels of mankind. She cannot afford to sink into the place that nations have usually occupied and become merely one of those who scramble and look about for selfish advantage. The Democratic Party has now a great opportunity, to which it must measure up. The honor of the nation is in its hands.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE PRESIDENT INSISTS THAT THERE SHALL BE NO ANTHRACITE COAL STRIKE

(A Letter to Representatives of Operators and Miners)

MAY 21, 1920

[The bituminous or "soft" coal strike had been ended in December, 1919, through the firm mediation of President Wilson. Several months later representatives of the anthracite or "hard" coal industry met to renew a wage agreement that was to expire on April 1, 1920, and their meetings developed into a protracted controversy which seemed at last to reach a breaking point.]

I have watched with more than passing interest your efforts to negotiate a new wage scale for the anthracite coal

fields. The arrangement to continue work at the mines after April 1, pending the adoption of a new agreement which you entered into when the previous wage scale was about to expire, was highly commendable and filled us all with hope that a new contract would be mutually worked out and the supply of anthracite coal continued without interruption. I sincerely trust that the hope will be fully realized.

I have, however, been advised that there is a possibility you may not come to an agreement. I am sure I need not remind you that we have not yet recovered from the economic losses incident to the war. We need the fullest productivity of our people to restore and maintain their own economic standards and to assist in the rehabilitation of Europe. A strike at any time in a great basic industry like anthracite coal mining would be a very disturbing factor in our lives and industries. To have one take place now while we are actively engaged in the problems of reconstruction would be a serious disaster. Anthracite coal is used principally in domestic consumption. Any shortage in the supply would affect a multitude of homes that have been specially equipped for the use of this kind of fuel. It would have to be supplemented by the use of substitutes, such as bituminous coal or oil, diverting these commodities from transportation and manufacturing industries which they now supply, using more cars because of the longer hauls and thereby reducing the efficiency of our transportation systems that are already burdened beyond their capacity. Such a condition must not occur if there is any way of avoiding it.

I am not familiar with the technical problems affecting the making of your wage scale. You are. You should therefore be able to effect an agreement. If for any reason you are unable to do so, I shall insist that the matters in dispute be submitted to the determination of a commission to be appointed by me, the award of the commission to be retroactive to the first of April in accordance with the arrangement you have already entered into, and that work be

continued at the mines pending the decision of the commission. I shall hold myself in readiness to appoint a commission similarly constituted to the one which I recently appointed in connection with the bituminous coal mining industry as soon as I learn that both sides have signified their willingness to continue at work and abide by its decision.

Message to Congress Urging Acceptance of a Mandate Over Armenia

May 24, 1920

Gentlemen of the Congress:

On the 14th of May an official communication was received at the Executive office from the secretary of the Senate of the United States conveying the following preambles and resolutions:

Whereas, The testimony adduced at the hearings conducted by the sub-committee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has clearly established the truth of the reported massacres and other atrocities from which the Armenian people have suffered; and

Whereas, The people of the United States are deeply impressed by the deplorable conditions of insecurity, starvation and misery now prevalent in Armenia; and

Whereas, The independence of the Republic of Armenia has been duly recognized by the Supreme Council of the Peace Conference and by the Government of the United States of America; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the sincere congratulations of the Senate of the United States are hereby extended to the people of Armenia on the recognition of the independence of the Republic of Armenia, without prejudice respecting the territorial boundaries involved; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States hereby expresses the hope that stable government, proper protection of individual liberties and rights, and the full realization of nationalistic aspirations may soon be attained by the Armenian people; and be it further

Resolved, That in order to afford necessary protection for the lives and property of citizens of the United States at the port of

Batum and along the line of the railroad leading to Baku, the President is hereby requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to cause a United States warship and a force of marines to be dispatched to such port with instructions to such marines to disembark and to protect American lives and property.

I received and read this document with great interest and with genuine gratification, not only because it embodied my own convictions and feelings with regard to Armenia and its people, but also, and more particularly, because it seemed to me the voice of the American people expressing their genuine convictions and deep Christian sympathies and intimating the line of duty which seemed to them to lie clearly before us.

I cannot but regard it as providential and not as a mere casual coincidence that almost at the same time I received information that the conference of statesmen now sitting at San Remo for the purpose of working out the details of peace with the Central Powers, which it was not feasible to work out in the conference at Paris, had formally resolved to address a definite appeal to this Government to accept a mandate for Armenia.

They were at pains to add that they did this "not for the smallest desire to evade any obligations which they might be expected to undertake, but because the responsibilities which they are already obliged to bear in connection with the disposition of the former Ottoman Empire will strain their capacities to the uttermost, and because they believe that the appearance on the scene of a power emancipated from the prepossessions of the Old World will inspire a wider confidence and afford a firmer guarantee for stability in the future than would the selection of any European power."

Early in the conferences at Paris it was agreed that to those colonies and territories which as a consequence of the late war have ceased to be under the sovereignty of the states which formerly governed them, and which are in-

habited by peoples not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world, there should be applied the principle that the well being and development of such peoples form a sacred trust of civilization, and that securities for the performance of this trust should be afforded.

It was recognized that certain communities formerly belonging to the Turkish Empire have reached a stage of development where their existence as independent nations can be provisionally recognized, subject to the rendering of administrative advice and assistance by the mandatory until such time as they are able to stand alone.

It is in pursuance of this principle and with a desire of affording Armenia such advice and assistance that the statesmen conferring at San Remo have formally requested this Government to assume the duties of mandatory in Armenia. I may add, for the information of the Congress, that at the same sitting it was resolved to request the President of the United States to undertake to arbitrate the difficult question of the boundary between Turkey and Armenia and the Vilayets of Erzerum, Trebizond, Van and Bitlis, and it was agreed to accept his decision thereupon, as well as any stipulation he may prescribe as to access to the sea for the independent state of Armenia.

In pursuance of this action, it was resolved to embody in the treaty with Turkey, now under final consideration, a provision that "Turkey and Armenia and the other high contracting parties agree to refer to the arbitration of the President of the United States of America the question of the boundary between Turkey and Armenia and the Vilayets of Erzerum, Trebizond, Van and Bitlis, and to accept his decision thereupon, as well as any stipulations he may prescribe as to access to the sea for the independent state of Armenia;" pending that decision the boundaries of Turkey and Armenia to remain as at present. I have thought it my duty to accept this difficult and delicate task.

In response to the invitation of the Council at San Remo, I urgently advise and request that the Congress grant the Executive power to accept for the United States a mandate over Armenia.

I make this suggestion in the earnest belief that it will be the wish of the people of the United States that this should be done. The sympathy with Armenia has proceeded from no single portion of our people, but has come with extraordinary spontaneity and sincerity from the whole of the great body of Christian men and women in this country, by whose free-will offerings Armenia has practically been saved at the most critical juncture of its existence. At their hearts this great and generous people have made the cause of Armenia their own.

It is to this people and to their government that the hopes and earnest expectations of the struggling people of Armenia turn as they now emerge from a period of indescribable suffering and peril, and I hope that the Congress will think it wise to meet this hope and expectation with the utmost liberality. I know from unmistakable evidence given by responsible representatives of many peoples struggling toward independence and peaceful life again that the Government of the United States is looked to with extraordinary trust and confidence, and I believe that it would do nothing less than arrest the hopeful processes of civilization if we were to refuse the request to become the helpful friends and advisers of such of these people as we may be authoritatively and formally requested to guide and assist.

I am conscious that I am urging upon the Congress a very critical choice, but I make the suggestion in the confidence that I am speaking in the spirit and in accordance with the wishes of the greatest of the Christian peoples. The sympathy for Armenia among our people has sprung from untainted consciences, pure Christian faith and an earnest desire to see Christian people everywhere succored in their time of suffering and lifted from their abject sub-

jection and distress and enabled to stand upon their feet and take their place among the free nations of the world.

Our recognition of the independence of Armenia will mean genuine liberty and assured happiness for her people if we fearlessly undertake the duties of guidance and assistance involved in the functions of a mandatory.

It is, therefore, with the most earnest hopefulness and with the feeling that I am giving advice from which the Congress will not willingly turn away, that I urge the acceptance of the invitation now formally and solemnly extended to us by the Council at San Remo, into whose hands has passed the difficult task of composing the many complexities and difficulties of government in the one-time Ottoman Empire and the maintenance of order and tolerable conditions of life in those portions of that Empire which it is no longer possible in the interest of civilization to leave under the government of the Turkish authorities themselves.

[One week later, on June 1, 1920, the Senate "respectfully declined" to give the President permission to establish an American mandate over Armenia. The vote was 23 in favor and 52 against.]

Message to Congress Vetoing Resolution to Declare Peace with Germany and Austria-Hungary

May 27, 1920

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my signature, House Joint Resolution 327, intended to repeal the Joint Resolution of April 6, 1917, declaring a state of war to exist between the United States and Germany, and the Joint Resolution of December 7, 1917, declaring a state of war to exist between

the United States and the Austro-Hungarian Government, and to declare a state of peace. I have not felt at liberty to sign this resolution because I cannot bring myself to become party to an action which would place ineffaceable stain upon the gallantry and honor of the United States.

The resolution seeks to establish peace with the German Empire without exacting from the German Government any action by way of setting right the infinite wrongs which it did to the peoples whom it attacked and whom we professed it our purpose to assist when we entered the war. Have we sacrified the lives of more than 100,000 Americans and ruined the lives of thousands of others and brought upon thousands of American families an unhappiness that can never end for purposes which we do not care to state or take further steps to attain?

The attainment of these purposes is provided for in the Treaty of Versailles by terms deemed adequate by the leading statesmen and experts of all the great peoples who were associated in the war against Germany. Do we now not care to join in the effort to secure them?

We entered the war most reluctantly. Our people were profoundly disinclined to take part in a European war, and at last did so, only because they became convinced that it could not in truth be regarded as only a European war, but must be regarded as a war in which civilization itself was involved and human rights of every kind as against a belligerent Government. Moreover, when we entered the war we set forth very definitely the purposes for which we entered, partly because we did not wish to be considered as merely taking part in a European contest. This Joint Resolution which I return does not seek to accomplish any of these objects, but in effect makes a complete surrender of the rights of the United States so far as the German Government is concerned.

A treaty of peace was signed at Versailles on the twenty-eighth of June last which did seek to accomplish the objects

which we had declared to be in our minds, because all the great Governments and peoples which united against Germany had adopted our declarations of purpose as their own and had in solemn form embodied them in communications to the German Government preliminary to the armistice of November 11, 1918. But the treaty as signed at Versailles has been rejected by the Senate of the United States, though it has been ratified by Germany. By that rejection and by its methods we had in effect declared that we wish to draw apart and pursue objects and interests of our own, unhampered by any connections of interest or of purpose with other Governments and peoples.

Notwithstanding the fact that upon our entrance into the war we professed to be seeking to assist in the maintenance of common interests, nothing is said in this resolution about the freedom of navigation upon the seas, or the reduction of armaments, or the vindication of the rights of Belgium, or the rectification of wrongs done to France, or the release of the Christian populations of the Ottoman Empire from the intolerable subjugation which they have had for so many generations to endure, or the establishment of an independent Polish State, or the continued maintenance of any kind of understanding among the great powers of the world which would be calculated to prevent in the future such outrages as Germany attempted and in part consummated.

We have now, in effect, declared that we do not care to take any further risks or to assume any further responsibilities with regard to the freedom of nations or the sacredness of international obligations or the safety of independent peoples. Such a peace with Germany—a peace in which none of the essential interests which we had at heart when we entered the war is safeguarded—is, or ought to be, inconceivable, as inconsistent with the dignity of the United States, with the rights and liberties of her citizens, and with the very fundamental conditions of civilization.

I hope that in these statements I have sufficiently set

forth the reasons why I have felt it incumbent upon me to withhold my signature.

WOODROW WILSON.

[On the following day this peace resolution of Senator Knox (Rep., Pa.), failed to pass in the House over the presidential veto. The vote was 219 for the resolution and 152 against it, a two-thirds vote being necessary for adoption. A similar resolution was passed by the next Congress and signed by President Harding on July 2, 1921.]

THE PRESIDENT CONDEMNS CONGRESS AS ACTUATED BY POLITICAL EXPEDIENCY

(A Telegram to Railroad Union Officials)

JUNE 5, 1920

[The first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress was coming to an end on this same day, and the heads of sixteen railroad brotherhoods had protested against adjournment without legislation seeking to reduce the cost of living. Both branches of Congress were controlled by Republicans.]

I received your telegram of June 3. You call my attention to matters that I presented to the present Congress in a special message delivered at a joint session of the two houses on August 8, 1919. In nine months this Congress has, however, taken no important remedial action with respect to the problem of the cost of living on the lines indicated in that address or on any other line. Not only has the present Congress failed to deal directly with the cost of living, but it has failed even to give serious consideration to the urgent appeal, oft repeated by me and by the Secretary of the Treasury, to revise the tax laws which in their present form are indirectly responsible in part for the high cost of living.

The protracted delay in dealing with the problem of the railroads, the problem of the Government-owned merchant marine and other similar urgent matters has resulted in un-

necessary burdens upon the public treasury, and ultimately in legislation so unsatisfactory that I could accept it, if at all, only because I despaired of anything better.

The present Congress has not only prevented the conclusion of peace in Europe, but has failed to prevent any constructive plan for dealing with the deplorable conditions there, the continuance of which can only reflect upon us.

In the light of the record of the present Congress, I have no reason whatever to hope that its continuance in session would result in constructive measures for the relief of the economic conditions to which you call attention. It must be evident to all that the dominating motive which has actuated this Congress is political expediency rather than lofty purpose to serve the public welfare.

President Wilson Urges Tennessee to Act Upon the Woman Suffrage Amendment

(A Telegram to the Governor)

June 23, 1920

[The legislatures of thirty-five States had ratified the amendment, and one more was required. Prompt action was desired in order to permit the women of the nation to vote at the approaching presidential election. Governor Roberts called the Tennessee legislature to meet in special session and the amendment was ratified on August 18.]

To Governor A. H. Roberts, Nashville, Tenn.:

It would be a real service to the party and to the nation if it is possible for you under the peculiar provisions of your State Constitution, having in mind the recent decision of the Supreme Court in the Ohio case, to call a special session of the Legislature of Tennessee to consider the suffrage amendment. Allow me to urge this very earnestly.

Woodrow Wilson.

The President Urges Bituminous Coal Miners to Abide by Their Agreement

July 30, 1920

[Mine workers in the bituminous coal fields of Illinois and Indiana had gone on strike in disregard of contract obligations.]

To the Members of the United Mine Workers of America:

Gentlemen—It is with a feeling of profound regret and sorrow that I have learned that many of the members of your organization, particularly in the State of Illinois, have engaged in a strike in violation of the terms of the award of the Bituminous Coal Commission and your agreement with the Government that the findings of the commission would be accepted by you as final and binding.

I am distressed not only because your action in refusing to mine coal upon the terms which you had accepted may result in great suffering in many households during the coming winter and interfere with the continuation of industrial and agricultural activity, which is the basis of the prosperity which you in common with the balance of our people have been enjoying, but also, and what is of far more importance to you, because the violation of the terms of your solemn obligation impairs your own good name, destroys the confidence which is the basis of all mutual agreements and threatens the very foundation of fair industrial relations. No government, no employer, no person having any reputation to protect can afford to enter into contractural relations with an organization that repeatedly or systematically violates its contracts.

The United Mine Workers of America is the largest single labour organization in the United States, if not in the world, but no organization can long endure that sets up its own strength as being superior to its plighted faith or its duty to society at large. It has in the past built up an enviable reputation for abiding by its contracts, which has been one of its most valuable assets in making wage agreements. It may now make temporary gains by taking ad-

vantage of the dire necessities of the balance of the people through the violation of these contracts, but what of the future? How can it expect wage contracts with the employers to be continued, in the face of such violations, when normal conditions have been restored and the country is free from the fear of immediate shortage of coal? How will it be able to resist the claims of the operators in the future who take advantage of the precedent which the miners have established and decrease wage rates in the middle of a wage contract under the plea that they are unable to sell the coal at the then existing cost of production?

A mere statement of these questions ought to be sufficient to awaken the mine workers to the dangerous course they are pursuing and the injuries they are inflicting upon themselves and the country at large by the adoption of these unwarranted strike policies.

In the consideration of the nation-wide wage scale involving many different classes of labour by the Bituminous Coal Commission in the limited time at its disposal some inequalities may have developed in the award that ought to be corrected. I cannot, however, recommend any consideration of such inequalities as long as the mine workers continue on strike in violation of the terms of the award which they had accepted as their wage agreement for a definite length of time.

I must therefore insist that the striking mine workers return to work, thereby demonstrating their good faith in keeping their contract. When I have learned that they have thus returned to work, I will invite the scale committees of the operators and miners to reconvene for the purpose of adjusting any such inequalities as they may mutually agree should be adjusted.

WOODROW WILSON.

[The president of the United Mine Workers promptly instructed the striking miners to return to work, and the President thereupon called a meeting of coal operators and miners to adjust inequalities in the Coal Commission's award.]

President Wilson Notifies Anthracite Coal Miners That They Must Accept the Arbitrators' Award

August 30, 1920

[An Anthracite Wage Commission had been appointed, which held its first session at Scranton, Pa., on June 24, 1920, and made an award that met with the President's approval. Increases in pay were granted averaging from 17 to 20 per cent., which did not entirely satisfy the miners.]

Replying to your telegram of August 29, your attention is particularly directed to the following language contained in the minority report of Mr. Ferry, of the Anthracite Coal Commission:

"In conclusion, Mr. President, we wish to say, as we did in the beginning, that the majority report shall have the full practical acceptance of the officers of the United Mine Workers of America, and we shall devote ourselves to its application, as we obligated ourselves to do when we submitted our cause to this commission."

That was the manly and honest thing for Mr. Ferry to do. He courageously sets forth his views in the minority report, and just as courageously declares he will abide by the decision of the majority, as the miners had obligated themselves to do.

It should be understood that there was no agreement between the operators and miners to have me decide the question at issue. With the many other important duties devolving upon me, I could not have devoted the time necessary to hear and digest all of the evidence presented. I therefore proposed the creation of a commission whose findings would be binding upon both parties. The representatives of the miners on the Scale Committee declined to accept the suggestion until it had been submitted to a convention of the United Mine Workers of Districts 1, 7 and 9. In that convention, by a vote of the men direct from the mines, a resolution was adopted accepting the proposi-

tion and solemnly obligating the mine workers to abide by the award.

By all the laws of honor upon which civilization rests, that pledge should be fulfilled. Any intimation that the anthracite mine workers will refuse to work under the award because it does not grant them all that they expected is a reflection upon the sincerity of the men who constitute the backbone of the community in which they live. Collective bargaining would soon cease to exist in industrial affairs if contracts solemnly entered into can be set aside by either party whenever it wills to do so. I am sure that the miners themselves would vigorously protest against the injustice of the act if the President attempted to set aside the award of the commission because the operators had protested against it.

May I add that I am personally and officially interested in promoting the welfare of every man who has to work for a living. Every influence my Administration has been able to exert has been exercised to improve the standards of living of the nation's working men and women without doing any injustice to other portions of our people.

A large part of the domestic fuel supply of the Eastern States is dependent upon the continued operation of the anthracite coal mines. Any prolonged stoppage of production will mean hardship and suffering to many people, including millions of wage workers and their families.

Yet if your communication, declaring your intention to refrain from working unless I set aside the award of the Anthracite Coal Commission on or before September 1, 1920, is intended as a threat you can rest assured that your challenge will be accepted and that the people of the United States will find some substitute fuel to tide them over until the real sentiment of the anthracite mine workers can find expression and they are ready to abide by the obligations they have entered into.

You are therefore advised that I cannot and will not set

aside the judgment of the Commission, and I shall expect the anthracite mine workers to accept the award and carry it into effect in good faith.

WOODROW WILSON.

AN APPEAL TO MAKE THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION A REFERENDUM ON THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

OCTOBER 3, 1920

My Fellow-Countrymen:

The issues of the present campaign are of such tremendous importance, of such far-reaching significance for the influence of the country and the development of its future relations, and I have necessarily had so much to do with their development, that I am sure you will think it natural and proper that I should address to you a few words concerning them.

Every one who sincerely believes in government by the people must rejoice at the turn affairs have taken in regard to this campaign. This election is to be a genuine national referendum. The determination of a great policy upon which the influence and authority of the United States in the world must depend is not to be left to groups of politicians of either party, but is to be referred to the people themselves for a sovereign mandate to their representatives. They are to instruct their own Government what they wish done.

The chief question that is put to you is, of course: Do you want your country's honor vindicated and the Treaty of Versailles ratified? Do you in particular approve of the League of Nations as organized and empowered in that treaty? And do you wish to see the United States play its responsible part in it?

You have been grossly misled with regard to the treaty,

and particularly with regard to the proposed character of the League of Nations, by those who have assumed the serious responsibility of opposing it. They have gone so far that those who have spent their lives, as I have spent my life, in familiarizing themselves with the history and traditions and policies of the nation, must stand amazed at the gross ignorance and impudent audacity which have led them to attempt to invent an "Americanism" of their own, which has no foundation whatever in any of the authentic traditions of the Government.

Americanism, as they conceive it, reverses the whole process of the last few tragical years. It would substitute America for Prussia in the policy of isolation and defiant segregation. Their conception of the dignity of the nation and its interest is that we should stand apart and watch for opportunities to advance our own interests, involve ourselves in no responsibility for the maintenance of the right in the world or for the continued vindication of any of the things for which we entered the war to fight.

The conception of the great creators of the Government was absolutely opposite to this. They thought of America as the light of the world, as created to lead the world in the assertion of the rights of peoples and the rights of free nations; as destined to set a responsible example to all the world of what free Government is and can do for the maintenance of right standards, both national and international.

This light the opponents of the League would quench. They would relegate the United States to a subordinate rôle in the affairs of the world.

Why should we be afraid of responsibilities which we are qualified to sustain and which the whole of our history has constituted a promise to the world we would sustain?

This is the most momentous issue that has ever been presented to the people of the United States, and I do not doubt that the hope of the whole world will be verified by an absolute assertion by the voters of the country of the

determination of the United States to live up to all the great expectations which they created by entering the war and enabling the other great nations of the world to bring it to a victorious conclusion, to the confusion of Prussianism and everything that arises out of Prussianism. Surely we shall not fail to keep the promise sealed in the death and sacrifice of our incomparable soldiers, sailors and marines who await our verdict beneath the sod of France.

Those who do not care to tell you the truth about the League of Nations tell you that Article X of the Covenant of the League would make it possbile for other nations to lead us into war, whether we will it by our own independent judgment or not. This is absolutely false. There is nothing in the Covenant which in the least interferes with or impairs the rights of Congress to declare war or not declare war, according to its own independent judgment, as our Constitution provides.

Those who drew the Covenant of the League were careful that it should contain nothing which interfered with or impaired the constitutional arrangements of any of the great nations which are to constitute its members. They would have been amazed and indignant at the things that are now being ignorantly said about this great and sincere document.

The whole world will wait for your verdict in November as it would wait for an intimation of what its future is to be.

WOODROW WILSON.

An Address to Pro-League Republicans

October 27, 1920

[Fifteen Republicans, men and women, called upon the President and were received by him in an invalid chair. This is the first formal address made by Mr. Wilson in more than a year.]

My Fellow-Countrymen:

It is to be feared that the supreme issue presented for your consideration in the present campaign is growing more obscure rather than clearer by reason of the many arbitrary turns the discussion of it has taken. The editors and publishers of the country would render a great service if they would publish the full text of the Covenant of the League of Nations, because, having read that text, you would be able to judge for yourselves a great many things in which you are now in danger of being misled. I hope sincerely that it will be very widely and generally published entire. It is with a desire to reclarify the issue and to assist your judgment that I take the liberty of stating again the case submitted to you in as simple terms as possible.

Three years ago it was my duty to summon you to the concert of war, to join the free nations of the world in meeting and ending the most sinister peril that had ever been developed in the irresponsible politics of the Old World. Your response to that call really settled the fortunes of war. You will remember that the morale of the German people broke down long before the strength of the German armies was broken. That was obviously because they felt that a great moral force, which they could not look in the face, had come into the contest, and that thenceforth all their professions of right were discredited and they were unable to pretend that their continuation of the war was not the support of a Government that had violated every principle of right and every consideration of humanity.

It is my privilege to summon you now to the concert of peace and the completion of the great moral achievement

on your part which the war represented, and in the presence of which the world found a reassurance and a recovery of force which it could have experienced in no other way.

We entered the war, as you remember, not merely to beat Germany, but to end the possibility of the renewal of such iniquitous schemes as Germany entertained. The war will have been fought in vain and our immense sacrifices thrown away unless we complete the work we then began, and I ask you to consider that there is only one way to assure the world of peace; that is by making it so dangerous to break the peace that no other nation will have the audacity to attempt it.

We should not be deceived into supposing that imperialistic schemes ended with the defeat of Germany, or that Germany is the only nation that entertained such schemes or was moved by sinister ambitions and long-standing jealousies to attack the very structure of civilization. There are other nations, which are likely to be powerfully moved or are already moved by commercial jealousy, by the desire to dominate and to have their own way in politics and in enterprise, and it is necessary to check them and to apprise them that the world will be united against them as it was against Germany if they attempt any similar thing.

The mothers and sisters and wives of the country know the sacrifice of war. They will feel that we have misled them and compelled them to make an entirely unnecessary sacrifice of their beloved ones if we do not make it as certain as it can be made that no similar sacrifice will be demanded of mothers and sisters and wives in the future. This duty is so plain that it seems to me to constitute a primary demand upon the conscience of every one of us.

It is inconceivable to most of us that any men should have been so false or so heartless as to declare that the women of the country would again have to suffer the intolerable burden and privation of war if the League of Nations were adopted.

The League of Nations is the well-considered effort of the whole group of nations who were opposed to Germany to secure themselves and the rest of mankind against the repetition of the war. It will have back of it the watchfulness and material force of all these nations and is such a guarantee of a peaceful future as no well-informed man can question who does not doubt the whole spirit with which the war was conducted against Germany.

The great moral influence of the United States will be absolutely thrown away if we do not complete the task which our soldiers and sailors so heroically undertook to execute.

One thing ought to be said, and said very clearly, about Article X of the Covenant of the League of Nations. It is the specific pledge of the members of the League that they will unite to resist exactly the things which Germany attempted, no matter who attempts them in the future. It is as exact a definition as could be given in general terms of the outrage which Germany would have committed if it could.

Germany violated the territorial integrity of her neighbors and flouted their political independence in order to aggrandize herself, and almost every war of history has originated in such designs. It is significant that the nations of the world should have at last combined to define the general cause of war and to exercise such concert as may be necessary to prevent such methods.

Article X, therefore, is the specific redemption of the pledge which the free Governments of the world gave to their people when they entered the war. They promised their people not only that Germany would be prevented from carrying out her plot, but that the world would be safeguarded in the future from similar designs.

We have now to choose whether we will make good or quit. We have joined issue, and the issue is between the spirit and purpose of the United States and the spirit and

purpose of imperialism, no matter where it shows itself. The spirit of imperialism is absolutely opposed to free government, to the safe life of free nations, to the development of peaceful industry, and to the completion of the righteous processes of civilization. It seems to me, and I think it will seem to you, that it is our duty to show the indomitable will and irresistible majesty of the high purpose of the United States, so that the part we played in the war as soldiers and sailors may be crowned with the achievement of lasting peace.

No one who opposes the ratification of the treaty of Versailles and the adoption of the Covenant of the League of Nations has proposed any other adequate means of bringing about settled peace. There is no other available or possible means, and this means is ready to hand. They have, on the contrary, tried to persuade you that the very pledge contained in Article X, which is the essential pledge of the whole plan of security, is itself a threat of war. It is, on the contrary, an assurance of the concert of all the free peoples of the world in the future, as in the recent past, to see justice done and humanity protected and vindicated.

This is the true, the real Americanism. This is the rôle of leadership and championship of the right which the leaders of the republic intended that it should play. The so-called Americanism which we hear so much prating about now is spurious and invented for party purposes only.

This choice is the supreme choice of the present campaign. It is regretable that this choice should be associated with a party contest. As compared with the choice of a course of action that now underlies every other, the fate of parties is a matter of indifference. Parties are significant now in this contest only because the voters must make up their minds which of the two parties is most likely to secure the indispensable result.

The nation was never called upon to make a more solemn determination than it must now make. The whole future

moral force of right in the world depends upon the United States rather than upon any other nation, and it would be pitiful, indeed, if after so many great free peoples had entered the great league, we should hold aloof.

I suggest that the candidacy of every candidate for whatever office be tested by this question: Shall we, or shall we not, redeem the great moral obligations of the United States?

President Wilson Accepts the League's Invitation to End Hostilities in Armenia

November 30, 1920

M. Paul Hymans, President, Council of the League of Nations, Geneva, Switzerland:

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your cabled message setting forth the resolution adopted by the Assembly of the League of Nations requesting the Council of the League to arrive at an understanding with the Governments with a view to intrusting a power with the task of taking the necessary measures to stop the hostilities in Armenia.

You offered to the United States the opportunity of undertaking the humanitarian task of using its good offices to end the present tragedy being enacted in Armenia, and you assure me that your proposal involves no repetition of the invitation to accept a mandate for Armenia.

While the invitation to accept the mandate for Armenia has been rejected by the Senate of the United States, this country has repeatedly declared its solicitude for the fate and welfare of the Armenian people in a manner and to an extent that justifies you in saying that the fate of Armenia has always been of special interest to the American people.

I am without authorization to offer or employ the military forces of the United States in any project for the relief of

Armenia, and any material contribution would require the authorization of the Congress, which is not now in session, and whose action I could not forecast.

I am willing, however, upon assurances of the moral and diplomatic support of the principal powers and in a spirit of sympathetic response to the request of the Council of the League of Nations to use my good offices and to proffer my personal mediation through a representative whom I may designate to end the hostilities that are now being waged against the Armenian people and to bring peace and accord to the contending parties, relying upon the Council of the League of Nations to suggest to me the avenues through which my proffer should be conveyed and the parties to whom it should be addressed.

WOODROW WILSON.

EIGHTH ANNUAL MESSAGE TO CONGRESS

DECEMBER 7, 1920

(Communicated in Writing)

Gentlemen of the Congress:

When I addressed myself to performing the duty laid upon the President by the Constitution to present to you an annual report of the state of the Union, I found my thought dominated by an immortal sentence of Abraham Lincoln's,

"Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us dare to do our duty as we understand it,"—

a sentence immortal because it embodies in a form of utter simplicity and purity the essential faith of the nation, the faith in which it was conceived and the faith in which it has grown to glory and power. With that faith and the birth of a nation founded upon it came the hope into the world that a new order would prevail throughout the affairs of mankind, an order in which reason and right would take

precedence of covetousness and force, and I believe that I express the wish and purpose of every thoughtful American when I say that this sentence marks for us in the plainest manner the part we should play alike in the arrangement of our domestic affairs and in our exercise of influence upon the affairs of the world. By this faith, and by this faith alone, can the world be lifted out of its present confusion and despair. It was this faith which prevailed over the wicked force of Germany. You will remember that the beginning of the end of the war came when the German people found themselves face to face with the conscience of the world and realized that right was everywhere arrayed against the wrong that their government was attempting to perpetrate. I think, therefore, that it is true to say that this was the faith which won the war. Certainly this is the faith with which our gallant men went into the field and out upon the seas to make sure of victory.

This is the mission upon which democracy came into the world. Democracy is an assertion of the right of the individual to live and to be treated justly as against any attempt on the part of any combination of individuals to make laws which will overburden him or which will destroy his equality among his fellows in the matter of right or privilege, and I think we all realize that the day has come when democracy is being put upon its final test. The old world is just now suffering from a wanton rejection of the principle of democracy and a substitution of the principle of autocracy as asserted in the name but without the authority and sanction of the multitude. This is the time of all others when democracy should prove its purity and its spiritual power to prevail. It is surely the manifest destiny of the United States to lead in the attempt to make this spirit prevail.

There are two ways in which the United States can assist to accomplish this great object: First, by offering the example within her own borders of the will and power of

democracy to make and enforce laws which are unquestionably just and which are equal in their administration,—laws which secure its full right to labour and yet at the same time safeguard the integrity of property, and particularly of that property which is devoted to the development of industry and the increase of the necessary wealth of the world. Second, by standing for right and justice as towards individual nations. The law of democracy is for the protection of the weak, and the influence of every democracy in the world should be for the protection of the weak nation, the nation which is struggling towards its right and towards its proper recognition and privilege in the family of nations. The United States cannot refuse this rôle of champion without putting the stigma of rejection upon the great and devoted men who brought its government into existence and established it in the face of almost universal opposition and intrigue, even in the face of wanton force, as, for example, against the Orders in Council of Great Britain and the arbitrary Napoleonic Decrees which involved us in what we know as the war of 1812. I urge you to consider that the display of an immediate disposition on the part of the Congress to remedy any injustices or evils that may have shown themselves in our own national life will afford the most effectual offset to the forces of chaos and tyranny which are playing so disastrous a part in the fortunes of the free peoples of more than one part of the world. The United States is of necessity the sample democracy of the world, and the triumph of democracy depends upon its success.

Recovery from the disturbing and sometimes disastrous effects of the late war has been exceedingly slow on the other side of the water and has given promise, I venture to say, of early completion only in our own fortunate country; but even with us the recovery halts and is impeded at times and there are immediately serviceable acts of legislation which it seems to me we ought to attempt, to assist that

recovery and prove the indestructible recuperative force of a great government of the people. One of these is to prove that a great democracy can keep house as successfully and in as businesslike a fashion as any other government. It seems to me that the first step towards proving this is to supply ourselves with a systematic method of handling our estimates and expenditures and bringing them to the point where they will not be an unnecessary strain upon our income or necessitate unreasonable taxation, in other words, a workable budget system, and I respectfully suggest that two elements are essential to such a system; namely, not only that the proposal of appropriations should be in the hands of a single body, such as a single appropriations committee in each house of the Congress, but also that this body should be brought into such cooperation with the departments of the Government and with the Treasury of the United States as would enable it to act upon a complete conspectus of the needs of the Government and the resources from which it must draw its income. I reluctantly vetoed the Budget Bill passed by the last session of the Congress because of a Constitutional objection. The house of Representatives subsequently modified the Bill in order to meet this objection. In the revised form I believe that the Bill, coupled with action already taken by the Congress to revise its rules and procedure, furnishes the foundations for an effective national budget system. I earnestly hope, therefore, that one of the first steps taken by the present session of the Congress will be to pass the Budget Bill.

The nation's finances have shown marked improvement during the past year. The total ordinary receipts of $6,694,000,000 for the fiscal year 1920 exceeded those for 1919 by $1,542,000,000, while the total net ordinary expenditures decreased from $18,514,000,000 to $6,403,-000,000. The gross public debt, which reached its highest point on August 31, 1919, when it was $26,596,000,000, had dropped on November 30, 1920, to $24,175,000,000.

There has also been a marked decrease in holdings of government war securities by the banking institutions of the country, as well as in the amount of bills held by the Federal Reserve Banks secured by government war obligations. This fortunate result has relieved the banks and left them freer to finance the needs of agriculture, industry and commerce. It has been due in large part to the reduction of the public debt, especially of the floating debt, but more particularly to the improved distribution of government securities among permanent investors. The cessation of the Government's borrowings except through short-term certificates of indebtedness has been a matter of great consequence to the people of the country at large, as well as to the holders of Liberty bonds and Victory notes, and has had an important bearing on the matter of effective credit control. The year has been characterized by the progressive withdrawal of the Treasury from the domestic credit market and from a position of dominant influence in that market. The future course will necessarily depend upon the extent to which economies are practiced and upon the burdens placed upon the Treasury, as well as upon industrial developments and the maintenance of tax receipts at a sufficiently high level.

The fundamental fact which at present dominates the Government's financial situation is that seven and a half billions of its war indebtedness mature within the next two and a half years. Of this amount, two and a half billions are floating debt and five billions Victory notes and War Savings certificates. The fiscal programme of the Government must be determined with reference to these maturities. Sound policy demands that government expenditures be reduced to the lowest amount which will permit the various services to operate efficiently and that government receipts from taxes and salvage be maintained sufficiently high to provide for current requirements, including interest and sinking fund charges on the public debt, and at the same

time retire the floating debt and part of the Victory Loan before maturity. With rigid economy, vigorous salvage operations and adequate revenues from taxation, a surplus of current receipts over current expenditures can be realized and should be applied to the floating debt. All branches of the Government should cooperate to see that this programme is realized.

I cannot overemphasize the necessity of economy in government appropriations and expenditures and the avoidance by the Congress of practices which take money from the Treasury by indefinite or revolving fund appropriations. The estimates for the present year show that over a billion dollars of expenditures were authorized by the last Congress in addition to the amounts shown in the usual compiled statements of appropriations. This strikingly illustrates the importance of making direct and specific appropriations. The relation between the current receipts and current expenditures of the Government during the present fiscal year, as well as during the last half of the last fiscal year, has been disturbed by the extraordinary burdens thrown upon the Treasury by the Transportation Act, in connection with the return of the railroads to private control. Over $600,000,000 has already been paid to the railroads under this act,—$350,000,000 during the present fiscal year; and it is estimated that further payments aggregating possibly $650,000,000 must still be made to the railroads during the current year. It is obvious that these large payments have already seriously limited the Government's progress in retiring the floating debt.

Closely connected with this, it seems to me, is the necessity for an immediate consideration of the revision of our tax laws. Simplification of the income and profits taxes has become an immediate necessity. These taxes performed an indispensable service during the war. The need for their simplification, however, is very great, in order to save the taxpayer inconvenience and expense and in order to make

his liability more certain and definite. Other and more detailed recommendations with regard to taxes will no doubt be laid before you by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

It is my privilege to draw to the attention of Congress for very sympathetic consideration the problem of providing adequate facilities for the care and treatment of former members of the military and naval forces who are sick or disabled as the result of their participation in the war. These heroic men can never be paid in money for the service they patriotically rendered the nation. Their reward will lie rather in realization of the fact that they vindicated the rights of their country and aided in safeguarding civilization. The nation's gratitude must be effectively revealed to them by the most ample provision for their medical care and treatment as well as for their vocational training and placement. The time has come when a more complete programme can be formulated and more satisfactorily administered for their treatment and training, and I earnestly urge that the Congress give the matter its early consideration. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Board for Vocational Education will outline in their annual reports proposals covering medical care and rehabilitation which I am sure will engage your earnest study and command your most generous support.

Permit me to emphasize once more the need for action upon certain matters upon which I dwelt at some length in my message to the Second Session of the Sixty-sixth Congress: the necessity, for example, of encouraging the manufacture of dyestuffs and related chemicals; the importance of doing everything possible to promote agricultural production along economic lines, to improve agricultural marketing and to make rural life more attractive and healthful; the need for a law regulating cold storage in such a way as to limit the time during which goods may be kept in storage, prescribing the method of disposing of them if

kept beyond the permitted period, and requiring goods released from storage in all cases to bear the date of their receipt. It would also be most serviceable if it were provided that all goods released from cold storage for interstate shipment should have plainly marked upon each package the selling or market price at which they went into storage, in order that the purchaser might be able to learn what profits stood between him and the producer or the wholesale dealer. Indeed, it would be very serviceable to the public if all goods destined for interstate commerce were made to carry upon every packing case whose form made it possible a plain statement of the price at which they left the hands of the producer. I respectfully call your attention, also, to the recommendations of the message referred to with regard to a federal license for all corporations engaged in interstate commerce.

In brief, the immediate legislative need of the time is the removal of all obstacles to the realization of the best ambitions of our people in their several classes of employment and the strengthening of all instrumentalities by which difficulties are to be met and removed and justice dealt out, whether by law or by some form of mediation and conciliation. I do not feel it to be my privilege at present to suggest the detailed and particular methods by which these objects may be attained, but I have faith that the inquiries of your several committees will discover the way and the method.

In response to what I believe to be the impulse of sympathy and opinion throughout the United States, I earnestly suggest that the Congress authorize the Treasury of the United States to make to the struggling Government of Armenia such a loan as was made to several of the Allied Governments during the war; and I would also suggest that it would be desirable to provide in the legislation itself that the expenditure of the money thus loaned should be under the supervision of a commission, or at least a commissioner,

from the United States, in order that revolutionary tendencies within Armenia itself might not be afforded by the loan a further tempting opportunity.

Allow me to call your attention to the fact that the people of the Philippine Islands have succeeded in maintaining a stable government since the last action of the Congress in their behalf, and have thus fulfilled the condition set by the Congress as precendent to a consideration of granting independence to the Islands. I respectfully submit that this condition precendent having been fulfilled, it is now our liberty and our duty to keep our promise to the people of those Islands by granting them the independence which they so honorably covet.

I have not so much laid before you a series of recommendations, gentlemen, as sought to utter a confession of faith, of the faith in which I was bred and which it is my solemn purpose to stand by until my last fighting day. I believe this to be the faith of America, the faith of the future, and of all the victories which await national action in the days to come, whether in America or elsewhere.

The President Refuses to Submit New Railway Wage Demands to Congress

February 6, 1921

[A telegram addressed to union officials and to the chairman of the Association of Railway Executives]

I have carefully considered the several telegrams addressed to me dealing with the labour questions and railroad management now under consideration by the Railroad Labour Board in Chicago.

The Transportation Act approved February 28, 1920, to a greater extent than any previous legislation places all questions dealing with finances and railroad management and necessary rates under the jurisdiction of the Interstate

Commerce Commission, hence all questions involving the expense of operation, the necessities of the railroads and the amount of money necessary to secure the successful operation thereof are now under the jurisdiction of the commission.

At the same time the act placed all questions of dispute between carriers and their employes and subordinate officials under the jurisdiction of the Railroad Labour Board, now sitting in Chicago. This board is composed of three members constituting the labour group, representing the employes and subordinate officials of the carriers; three members constituting the management group, representing the carriers, and three members constituting the public group, representing the public. So far as I am advised, the board may be relied on to give careful and intelligent consideration to all questions within its jurisdiction. To seek to influence either of these bodies upon anything which has been placed within their jurisdiction by Congress would be unwise and open to grave objection.

It would be manifestly unwise for me, therefore, to take any action which would interfere with the orderly procedure of the Interstate Commerce Commission or of the Railroad Labour Board, and all the matters mentioned in your telegram are within the jurisdiction of one or the other of these bodies; and in their action I think we may repose entire confidence.

In view of the foregoing, it does not seem wise to comply with your suggestion that the matter be submitted to the Congress, and the only action deemed necessary is to submit copies of the telegrams received from you and from the representatives of the railroad executives to the Interstate Commerce Commission and to the Railroad Labour Board for such action as these bodies may deem wise in the premises. This will be done.

Special Message to Congress Asking Fulfillment of a Pledge to Belgium

February 21, 1921

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I herewith call your attention to an agreement with Belgium made by the British and French Premiers and myself, which is embodied in the following letter:

June 16, 1919.

M. Hymans, Ministre des Affaires Etrangères, Hotel Lotti, Paris:

Sir—The reparation clauses of the draft treaty of peace with Germany obligate Germany to make reimbursement of all sums which Belgium has borrowed from the Allied and Associated Governments up to November 11, 1918, on account of the violation by Germany of the Treaty of 1839. As evidence of such an obligation Germany is to make a special issue of bonds to be delivered to the Reparation Commission.

Each of the undersigned will recommend to the appropriate governmental agency of his Government that, upon the delivery to the Reparation Commission of such bonds, his Government accept an amount thereof corresponding to the sums which Belgium has borrowed from his Government since the war and up to November 11, 1918, together with interest at 5 per cent., unless already included in such sums, in satisfaction of Belgium's obligation on account of such loans, which obligation of Belgium's shall thereupon be cancelled.

We are, dear Mr. Minister,

Very truly yours,

G. Clemenceau,
Woodrow Wilson,
D. Lloyd George.

In recommending to you that Congress take appropriate action with regard to this agreement, certain facts should be brought to your attention.

The neutrality of Belgium was guaranteed by the Treaty of London of 1839. In considering the reparation to be made by Germany it was agreed that the action of Germany in grossly violating this treaty by an attack on Belgium obligated the German Government under international law to repay to Belgium the costs of war. On this prin-

ciple the Treaty of Versailles (Art. 232) provided that in accordance with Germany's pledges already given as to the complete restoration for Belgium, Germany should undertake, in addition to the compensation for material damage, to make reimbursement of all sums which Belgium had borrowed from the Allied and Associated Governments up to November 11, 1918, together with interest at 5 per cent. per annum on such sums. This obligation was to be discharged by a special issue of bearer bonds to an equivalent amount payable in gold marks on May 1, 1926, or at the option of the German Government on the first of May in any year up to 1926.

For various reasons the undertaking defined in the above letter was not embodied in the treaty. Belgium's obligations to the United States for advances made up to the date of the armistice amounted to approximately $171,000,000, and to England and France they amounted, I am informed, to about $164,700,000. In view of the special circumstances in which Belgium became involved in the war and the attitude of this country toward Belgium, it was felt that the United States might well agree to make the same agreement respecting pre-armistice loans to Belgium as England and France offered to do.

Advances made by the Treasury to the Belgian Government from the beginning of the war to the armistice amounted to $171,780,000. This principal sum, however, includes advances of $499,400 made to enable the Belgians to pay the interest due November 15, 1917, and $1,571,468.42 to enable the payment of the interest, due May 15, 1918. The interest on the advances has been paid up to April 15, 1919, the interest due from May 15, 1918, to that date having been paid out of Treasury loans for which the United States holds Belgian obligations, which, however, were made after November 11, 1918, the date of the armistice. This latter advance would not come within the terms of the agreement above mentioned.

If, therefore, the United States accepts payment of Belgian obligations given before the armistice by receiving a corresponding amount of German obligations, it would seem that it should receive German obligations amounting to $171,780,000 with interest from April 15, 1919.

Although it is understood that England and France will take their share of the German bonds when received by Belgium, I am informed that the Reparation Commission has not as yet finally determined the details of issuance of the necessary bonds by the German Government. A recommendation at this time that suitable legislative action should be taken may appear somewhat premature; but, in view of the approaching termination of my Administration, I have brought this matter to your attention, hoping that suitable action may be taken at the appropriate time.

WOODROW WILSON.

VETO OF THE EMERGENCY TARIFF BILL

MARCH 3, 1921

The House of Representatives:

I return herewith without my approval H. R. 15,275, an act imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, to provide revenues and for other purposes.

The title of this measure indicates that it has several purposes. The report of the Committee on Ways and Means reveals that its principal object is to furnish relief to certain producers in the nation who have been unable to discover satisfactory markets in foreign countries for their products and whose prices have fallen.

Very little reflection would lead any one to conclude that the measure would not furnish in any substantial degree the relief sought by the producers of most of the

staple commodities which it covers. This nation has been for very many years a large exporter of agricultural products. For nearly a generation before it entered the European war its exports exceeded its imports of agricultural commodities by from approximately $200,000,000 to more than $500,000,000. In recent years this excess has greatly increased, and in 1919 reached the huge total of $1,904,292,000. The excess of exports of staple products is especially marked. In 1913 the nation imported 783,481 bushels of wheat, valued at $670,931, and in 1920 35,848,648 bushels, worth $75,398,834, while it exported in 1913 99,508,968 bushels, worth $95,098,838, and in 1920 218,280,231 bushels, valued at $596,957,796.

In the year 1913 it imported 85,183 barrels of wheat flour, valued at $347,877, and in 1920, 800,788 barrels, valued at $8,669,300, while it exported in the first year 12,278,206 barrels, valued at $56,865,444, and in 1920, 19,853,952 barrels, valued at $224,472,448. In 1913 it imported $3,888,604 worth of corn, and in 1920, $9,257,377 worth, while its exports in the first year were valued at $26,515,146 and in 1920 at $26,453,681. Of unmanufactured cotton in 1920 it imported approximately 300,000,000 pounds, valued at $138,743,000, while it exported more than 3,179,000,000 pounds, worth over $1,136,000,000. Of preserved milk, in the same year it imported $3,331,812 worth and exported $65,239,020 worth. Its imports in the same year of sugar and wool of course greatly exceeded its exports.

It is obvious that for the commodities, except sugar and wool, mentioned in the measure, actual relief can come only from the adoption of constructive measures of a broader scope, from the restoration of peace everywhere in the world, the resumption of normal industrial pursuits, the recovery particularly of Europe, and the discovery there of additional credit foundations on the basis of which her people may arrange to take from farmers and other pro-

ducers of this nation a greater part of their surplus production.

One does not pay a compliment to the American farmer who attempts to alarm him by dangers from foreign competition. The American farmers are the most effective agricultural producers in the world. Their production is several times as great for each worker as that of their foreign rivals. This grows out of the intelligence of the American farmer, the nature of his agricultural practices and economy and the fact that he has the assistance of scientific and practical agencies, which in respect to variety of activity, of personnel and of financial support exceed those of any other two or three nations in the world combined. There is little doubt that the farmers of this nation will not only continue mainly to supply the home demand, but will be increasingly called upon to supply a large part of the needs of the rest of the world.

What the farmer now needs is not only a better system of domestic marketing and credit, but especially larger foreign markets for his surplus products.

Clearly, measures of this sort will not conduce to an expansion of the foreign market. It is not a little singular that a measure which strikes a blow at our foreign trade should follow so closely upon the action of Congress directing the resumption of certain activities of the War Finance Corporation, especially at the urgent insistence of representatives of the farming interests, who believed that its resumption would improve foreign marketing. Indeed, when one surveys recent activities in the foreign field, and measures enacted affecting the foreign trade, one cannot fail to be impressed with the fact that there is consistency only in their contradictions and inconsistencies.

We have been vigorously building up a great merchant marine and providing for improvement of marketing in foreign countries by the passage of an export trade law and of measures for the promotion of banking agencies in

foreign countries. Now it appears that we propose to render these measures abortive in whole or in part.

I imagine there is little doubt that while this measure is temporary, it is intended as a foundation for action of a similar nature of a very general and permanent character. It would seem to be designed to pave the way for such action. If there ever was a time when America had anything to fear from foreign competition that time has passed. I cannot believe that American producers who in most respects are the most effective in the world, can have any dread of competition when they view the fact that their country has come through the great struggle of the last few years, relatively speaking, untouched, while their principal competitors are in varying degrees sadly stricken and labouring under adverse conditions from which they will not recover for many years.

Changes of a very radical character have taken place. The United States has become a great creditor nation. She has lent certain Governments of Europe more than $9,000,000,000, and as a result of the enormous excess of our exports there is an additional commercial indebtedness of foreign nations to our own of perhaps not less than $4,000,000,000. There are only three ways in which Europe can meet her part of her indebtedness, namely, by the establishment of private credits, by the shipment of gold, or of commodities. It is difficult for Europe to discover the requisite securities as a basis for the necessary credits. Europe is not in a position at the present time to send us the amount of gold which would be needed, and we could not view further large imports of gold into this country without concern. The result, to say the least, would be a larger disarrangement of international exchange and disturbance of international trade.

If we wish to have Europe settle her debts, Governmental or commercial, we must be prepared to buy from her, and if we wish to assist Europe and ourselves by the

export either of food, of raw materials, or of finished products, we must be prepared to welcome commodities which we need and which Europe will be prepared, with no little pain, to send us.

Clearly, this is no time for the erection here of high trade barriers. It would strike a blow at the large and successful efforts which have been made by many of our great industries to place themselves on an export basis. It would stand in the way of the normal readjustment of business conditions throughout the world, which is as vital to the welfare of this country as to that of all the other nations. The United States has a duty to itself as well as to the world, and it can discharge this duty by widening, not by contracting, its world markets.

This measure has only slight interest so far as its prospective revenue yields are concerned. It is estimated that the aggregate addition to the nation's income from its operation for ten months would be less than $72,000,000, and of this more than half would arise from the proposed duty on sugar. Obviously this and much more can be secured in ways known to the Congress, which would be vastly less burdensome to the American consumer and American industry.

The rates, however, have a peculiar interest. In practically every case they either equal or exceed those established under the Payne-Aldrich act, in which the principle of protection reached its high water mark, and the enactment of which was followed by an effective exhibition of protest on the part of the majority of the American people. I do not believe that the sober judgment of the masses of the people of the nation, or even of the special class whose interests are immediately affected by this measure, will sanction a return, especially in view of conditions which lend even less justification for such action, to a policy of legislation for selfish interests which will foster monopoly and increase the disposition to look upon the Government

as an instrument for private gain instead of an instrument for the promotion of the general wellbeing.

Such a policy is antagonistic to the fundamental principle of equal and exact justice to all, and can only serve to revive the feeling of irritation on the part of the great masses of the people and of lack of confidence in the motives of rulers and the results of government.

[On the next day, at noon, March 5, 1921, Woodrow Wilson's second term as President of the United States came to an end and he retired to private life. During the three years that remained before his death in February, 1924, there were only two brief messages that came from him to his fellow citizens—one a magazine article and the other a speech over the radio.]

An Article Contributed to "The Atlantic Monthly" By Woodrow Wilson

August, 1923

THE ROAD AWAY FROM REVOLUTION [1]

In these doubtful and anxious days, when all the world is at unrest and, look which way you will, the road ahead seems darkened by shadows which portend dangers of many kinds, it is only common prudence that we should look about us and attempt to assess the causes of distress and the most likely means of removing them.

There must be some real ground for the universal unrest and perturbation. It is not to be found in superficial politics or in mere economic blunders. It probably lies deep at the sources of the spiritual life of our time. It leads to revolution; and perhaps if we take the case of the Russian Revolution, the outstanding event of its kind in our age,

[1] Copyright by the Atlantic Monthly Press, Inc., in the United States of America and in Great Britain. All rights reserved.

we may find a good deal of instruction for our judgment of present critical situations and circumstances.

What gave rise to the Russian Revolution? The answer can only be that it was the product of a whole social system. It was not in fact a sudden thing. It had been gathering head for several generations. It was due to the systematic denial to the great body of Russians of the rights and privileges which all normal men desire and must have if they are to be contented and within reach of happiness. The lives of the great mass of the Russian people contained no opportunities, but were hemmed in by barriers against which they were constantly flinging their spirits, only to fall back bruised and dispirited. Only the powerful were suffered to secure their rights or even to gain access to the means of material success.

It is to be noted as a leading fact of our time that it was against "capitalism" that the Russian leaders directed their attack. It was capitalism that made them see red; and it is against capitalism under one name or another that the discontented classes everywhere draw their indictment.

There are thoughtful and well-informed men all over the world who believe, with much apparently sound reason, that the abstract thing, the system, which we call capitalism, is indispensable to the industrial support and development of modern civilization. And yet everyone who has an intelligent knowledge of social forces must know that great and widespread reactions like that which is now unquestionably manifesting itself against capitalism do not occur without cause or provocation; and before we commit ourselves irreconcilably to an attitude of hostility to this movement of the time, we ought frankly to put to ourselves the question, Is the capitalistic system unimpeachable? which is another way of asking, Have capitalists generally used their power for the benefit of the countries in which their capital is employed and for the benefit of their fellow men?

Is it not, on the contrary, too true that capitalists have

often seemed to regard the men whom they used as mere instruments of profit, whose physical and mental powers it was legitimate to exploit with as slight cost to themselves as possible, either of money or of sympathy? Have not many fine men who were actuated by the highest principles in every other relationship of life seemed to hold that generosity and humane feeling were not among the imperative mandates of conscience in the conduct of a banking business, or in the development of an industrial or commercial enterprise?

And, if these offenses against high morality and true citizenship have been frequently observable, are we to say that the blame for the present discontent and turbulence is wholly on the side of those who are in revolt against them? Ought we not, rather, to seek a way to remove such offenses and make life itself clean for those who will share honorably and cleanly in it?

The world has been made safe for democracy. There need now be no fear that any such mad design as that entertained by the insolent and ignorant Hohenzollerns and their counselors may prevail against it. But democracy has not yet made the world safe against irrational revolution. That supreme task, which is nothing less than the salvation of civilization, now faces democracy, insistent, imperative. There is no escaping it, unless everything we have built up is presently to fall in ruin about us; and the United States, as the greatest of democracies, must undertake it.

The road that leads away from revolution is clearly marked, for it is defined by the nature of men and of organized society. It therefore behooves us to study very carefully and very candidly the exact nature of the task and the means of its accomplishment.

The nature of men and of organized society dictates the maintenance in every field of action of the highest and purest standards of justice and of right dealing; and it is essential to efficacious thinking in this critical matter that

we should not entertain a narrow or technical conception of justice. By justice the lawyer generally means the prompt, fair, and open application of impartial rules; but we call ours a Christian civilization, and a Christian conception of justice must be much higher. It must include sympathy and helpfulness and a willingness to forego self-interest in order to promote the welfare, happiness, and contentment of others and of the community as a whole. This is what our age is blindly feeling in its reaction against what it deems the too great selfishness of the capitalistic system.

The sum of the whole matter is this, that our civilization cannot survive materially unless it be redeemed spiritually. It can be saved only by becoming permeated with the spirit of Christ and being made free and happy by the practices which spring out of that spirit. Only thus can discontent be driven out and all the shadows lifted from the road ahead.

Here is the final challenge to our churches, to our political organizations, and to our capitalists—to everyone who fears God or loves his country. Shall we not all earnestly cooperate to bring in the new day?

An Address Over the Radio on the Eve of Armistice Day

November 10, 1923.

The anniversary of Armistice Day should stir us to great exaltation of spirit because of the proud recollection that it was our day, a day above those early days of that never-to-be-forgotten November which lifted the world to the high levels of vision and achievement upon which the great war for democracy and right was fought and won; although the stimulating memories of that happy time of triumph are forever marred and embittered for us by the shameful fact

that when the victory was won—won, be it remembered—chiefly by the indomitable spirit and ungrudging sacrifices of our own incomparable soldiers—we turned our backs upon our associates and refused to bear any responsible part in the administration of peace, or the firm and permanent establishment of the results of the war—won at so terrible a cost of life and treasure—and withdrew into a sullen and selfish isolation which is deeply ignoble because manifestly cowardly and dishonorable.

This must always be a source of deep mortification to us and we shall inevitably be forced by the moral obligations of freedom and honor to retrieve that fatal error and assume once more the rôle of courage, self-respect and helpfulness which every true American must wish to regard as our natural part in the affairs of the world.

That we should have thus done a great wrong to civilization at one of the most critical turning points in the history of the world is the more to be deplored because every anxious year that has followed has made the exceeding need for such services as we might have rendered more and more evident and more and more pressing, as demoralizing circumstances which we might have controlled have gone from bad to worse.

And now, as if to furnish a sort of sinister climax, France and Italy between them have made waste paper of the Treaty of Versailles and the whole field of international relationship is in perilous confusion.

The affairs of the world can be set straight only by the firmest and most determined exhibition of the will to lead and make the right prevail.

Happily, the present situation in the world of affairs affords us the opportunity to retrieve the past and to render mankind the inestimable service of proving that there is at least one great and powerful nation which can turn away from programs of self-interest and devote itself to practising and establishing the highest ideals of disinterested ser-

vice and the consistent maintenance of exalted standards of conscience and of right.

The only way in which we can worthily give proof of our appreciation of the high significance of Armistice Day is by resolving to put self-interest away and once more formulate and act upon the highest ideals and purposes of international policy.

Thus, and only thus, can we return to the true traditions of America.

NOTABLE PHRASES OF WOODROW WILSON

If you think too much about being reëlected, it is very difficult to be worth reëlecting. *Page 30.*

We shall not, I believe, be obliged to alter our policy of watchful waiting. *(Mexico.) Page 39.*

I shall not know how to deal with other matters of even greater delicacy and nearer consequence if you do not grant it to me in ungrudging measure. *(Repeal of provision for free tolls for American coastwise ships through Panama Canal.) Page 59.*

We must depend . . . not upon a standing army, nor yet upon a reserve army, but upon a citizenry trained and accustomed to arms. *Page 78.*

There is such a thing as a man being too proud to fight. There is such a thing as a nation being so right that it does not need to convince others by force that it is right. *Page 117.*

No man in the United States knows what a single week or a single day or a single hour may bring forth. *(A plea for military preparedness, January, 1916.) Page 172.*

There may at any moment come a time when I cannot preserve both the honor and the peace of the United States. *Page 177.*

The United States would be constrained to hold the Imperial German Government to a strict accountability. *Page 222.*

The Imperial German Government will not expect the Government of the United States to omit any word or any act necessary to the performance of its sacred duty of maintaining the rights of the United States and its citizens. *Page 243.*

Unless the Imperial Government should now immediately declare and effect an abandonment of its present methods of submarine warfare against passenger and freight-carrying vessels, the Government of the United States can have no choice but to sever diplomatic relations with the German Empire altogether. *Page 262.*

The United States is willing to become a partner in any feasible association of nations formed in order to realize these objects. *(The guarantee of territorial integrity and political independence, and the prevention of hasty wars.)* *Page 274.*

Property rights can be vindicated by claims for damages . . . but the fundamental rights of humanity cannot be. *Page 310.*

So long as the power of recognition rests with me, the Government of the United States will refuse to extend the hand of welcome to anyone who obtains power in a sister republic by treachery and violence. *Page 313.*

It must be a peace without victory. *Page 352.*

I advise that the Congress declare the recent course of the Imperial German Government to be in fact nothing less than war against the government and people of the United States. *Page 376.*

We have no quarrel with the German people. *Page 378.*

The world must be made safe for democracy. *Page 381.*

The right is more precious than peace. *Page 382.*

It is not an army that we must shape and train for war; it is a nation. *Page 393.*

America in this war . . . seeks no material profit or aggrandizement of any kind. She is fighting . . . for the liberation of peoples everywhere from the aggressions of autocratic force. *Page 396.*

The day has come to conquer or submit. *Page 408.*

For us there is but one choice. We have made it. *Page 418.*

Balked, but not defeated, the enemy of four-fifths of the world. *(The German Government.)* *Page 422.*

Will you cooperate or obstruct? *(To striking carpenters in shipyards.)* *Page 486.*

Friendship is the only cement that will ever hold the world together. *Page 488.*

Politics is adjourned. The elections will go to those who think least of it. *Page 495.*

There can be but one issue. The settlement must be final. There can be no compromise. No half-way decision is conceivable. *Page 500.*

Peoples and provinces are not to be bartered about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were mere chattels and pawns in a game, even the great game, now forever discredited, of the balance of power. *Page 478.*

You have the alternative, armed isolation or peaceful partnership. *Page 773.*

It [the peace treaty] is the first great international agreement . . . where the principle adopted has been, not the power of the strong, but the right of the weak. *Page 784.*

The world is disordered, and while it is disordered—we debate! *Page 866.*

The truth is the regnant and triumphant thing in this world. You may trample it under foot, you may blind its eyes with blood, but you cannot kill it; and sooner or later it rises up and seeks and gets revenge. *Page 898.*

I am going to devote every energy I have and all the authority I have . . . to see to it that no minority commands the United States. *Page 948.*

It is a treaty where peace rests upon the right of the weak, and only the power of the strong can maintain the right of the weak. *Page 1017.*

The principle of justice, the principle of right, the principle of international amity is this, that there is not only an imaginary but a real equality of standing and right among all the sovereign peoples of the world. *Page 1024.*

We said that this was a people's war—and we said that it must be a people's peace. It is a people's peace. *Page 1087.*

The recent war has ended our isolation. *Page 1141.*

There can be no permanent and lasting settlements between capital and labour which do not recognize the fundamental concepts for which labour has been struggling through the years. *Page 1148.*

The right of individuals to strike is inviolate . . . but there is a predominant right . . . of the Government to protect all of its people. *Page 1150.*

The United States enjoyed the spiritual leadership of the world until the Senate failed to ratify the treaty. *Page 1161.*

This nation went into the war to make an end of militarism, to furnish guarantees to weak nations, and to make a just and lasting peace. *Page 1162.*

We cannot re-write this treaty. We must take it without changes which alter its meaning, or leave it. *Page 1163.*

Give the next election the form of a great and solemn referendum on the part the United States is to play in completing the settlements of the war. *Page 1163.*

No organization can long endure that sets up its own strength as being superior . . . to society at large. *Page 1200.*

France and Italy between them have made waste paper of the Treaty of Versailles. *Page 1233.*

INDEX

A

Acceptance speech (renomination), 302
Adriatic settlement, 1168
Agricultural credits (See Farm credits)
Agriculture, Department of: Its importance to the world, 103
Agriculture, Future development of, 328 (See also Farmer)
Alaska: Railways and development planned, 45
Alaska: Territorial government urged, 45
Alliances, Entangling, 1036
Alsace-Lorraine wrong of 1871 should be righted, 469
America first, 109, 175, 846
America cannot stand alone in the world, 768, 859, 889, 904, 953, 1046
America, European attitude towards, 695, 710, 883, 952, 1002, 1034, 1075
America must play the part of leadership, 850, 865, 937, 1025, 1076, 1110
America, Spirit of, 115, 122, 127, 211, 291, 787, 793
America, Without hampering ambitions as world power, 111, 134, 168, 199, 313, 882, 1003, 1058
American Electric Railway Association, Address before, 97
American Federation of Labour, Address before, 434
American soldiers, Address to, 578
American soldiers, foreign attitude towards, 695, 700; spirit of, 795
American system of government, Balance of, 324; a lawyer's government, 324
Americans, Disloyal ("hyphenated"), 110, 132, 150, 293, 310, 846, 1104, 1113
Americans, foreign born, Addresses to, 114, 290
Americans, Undivided allegiance of, 110, 115, 125, 132
Anti-trust legislation (See Sherman Anti-Trust Law and Trusts and Monopolies)
Arabia in the Turkish peace treaty, 1186
Arbitration and discussion basis of thirty U. S. treaties with foreign powers, 778, 824
Arbitration, Failure of, in railroad eight-hour demand, 296
Arbitration law, Suggested changes in, 301; recommendations renewed, 339
Arbitration treaties; Ratification urged, 38; United States a party to, 778, 824
Armament incompatible with democracy, 771, 821, 870, 1108, 1127
Armament and reduction, 704
Armenia:
  In the Turkish peace treaty, 1186
  Loan recommended, 1219
  Mandate urged, 1191
  Moral and diplomatic support promised, 1211
  Safeguarded in the Versailles treaty, 783, 1079
  (See also Peace Treaty: Weak nations)
Armistice day messages, 1136, 1232
Army (See Defense, National)
Associated Press, Address before members of, 108
"Atlantic Monthly" article, 1229
Austria-Hungary:
  Appeals for discussion of peace, 533, 536; is refused, 535
  Diplomatic relations interrupted, but peace maintained, 381
  Diplomatic correspondence with, 254, 545
  Must be delivered from Prussian domination, 447
  Must continue to have access to sea, 450
  No longer aggressive force in Adriatic, 660
  Offers separate peace to United States, 545

Austria-Hungary (cont'd):
People must be accorded free opportunity for autonomous development, 469
Referred to Czechoslovaks and Jugoslavs, 540
Treaty follows principles of treaty with Germany, 1114
War against, advised, 451
(See also Peace Treaty: Weak nations)
Austro-Hungarian Empire not to be rearranged by United States, 447
Autocracy, revolution against, during 19th century, 1053
Aviation (See Defense, National)

B

Bagdad Railway, 437 (See also "Bremen to Bagdad")
Balkan States controlled by Germany, 437, 447
Banking: Restrictions upon national banks in international trade, 279, 289
Banking legislation (See Currency, also Federal Reserve Bank System)
Belgium:
Address before Parliament, 686
Congress asked to fulfill a pledge, 1222
Has underwritten civilization, 925, 941
Industrial revival, 690
Must be evacuated and restored, 469
Proposed as member of first League Council, 666
Violation of, 745, 770
Benedict, Pope, Peace proposal of, and reply, 421
Billings, Mont., Address at, 867
Bismarck, No. Dak., Address at, 856
Bohemia (See Czechoslovakia; also Peace Treaty: Weak nations)
Boston, Mass., Address at, 638
Brazil, Messages to, on its entry into war, 432
Brazil, proposed as member of first League Council, 666
"Bremen to Bagdad," formula of Pan-Germanism, 771, 816, 902, 994, 1105
Budget system recommended, 1138, 1215
Bulgaria: Treaty of Peace with, follows principles of treaty with Germany, 1114 (See Peace Treaty)
Business:
Not to be penalized because big and strong, 102
Past the era of suspicion and into era of confidence, 100
Relation of Government to, 103
Some needs of, 12
Spirit of American business toward regulation, 93, 97
(See also Trusts, Trade Commission, Corporations, Directors, Sherman Anti-Trust Law, Commerce)

C

Capital Issues Committee, act to reduce speculation, 722
Central America (See Latin-America)
Cheyenne, Wyo., Address at, 1084
Children, Cooperation of, in Red Cross work proposed, 427
China, European concessions in, 1041 (See also Shantung)
"Citizenry trained and accustomed to arms," 78
Citizenship address at Philadelphia, 114; at Washington, 290
Clemenceau proposed as chairman of Peace Conference, 614
Coal strike settlement, 1133, 1152, 1155, 1189, 1200, 1202
Cœur d'Alene, Idaho, Address at, 900
Cold-storage legislation recommended, 1146, 1218
Colombia, Treaty of friendship with, 564
Columbus, Ohio, Address at, 727
Commerce:
International exclusive economic leagues condemned, 424
Limitations imposed by banking restrictions, 279, 289, 329
New fields of foreign commerce, 69, 106, 279, 328
Proposal to remove restrictions on combinations of exporters, 316, 333, 341, 452
War's effect in increasing exports, 1140, 1225
Commerce, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic, Usefulness of, 104, 316, 330

Confederate veterans, Addresses before, 14, 408
Congress:
Actuated by political expediency, 1198
Appeal for Democratic majority, 557
Commended, 429
Constitutional rights of, preserved, 1000
Criticized, 558, 1161, 1198, 1205
House should prepare appropriation bills through single committee, 453
Members and problems of early days, 27, 31
Record of, during first Wilson administration, 304
Congress, Messages to
First Annual, 37
Second Annual, 67
Third Annual, 133
Fourth Annual, 337
Fifth Annual, 443
Sixth Annual, 559
Seventh Annual, 1138
Eighth Annual, 1212
Appropriation bills urged, 671
Armistice terms with Germany, 548
Belgian debt, 1222
Cost of living, 713
Currency revision, 10
German submarine controversy, 262, 358, 363, 372
Labour, 672
Merchant ships, Arming of, 363
Mexico, 18, 59
Panama Canal tolls, 57
Railroad administration, 459
Railroad strike threat, 294
Revenue, 64
Special Session, Sixty-sixth, 671
Tariff, 5
Trusts and Monopolies, 47
War aims and peace terms of the United States, 464
War with Germany, 372
(See also "Senate")
Congress Hall, Philadelphia, Address at rededication of, 27
Conservation legislation, 70, 86
Constantinople, key to Europe, 756; future of, 1183
Constitutional rights of Congress preserved, 1000
Cost of living, Address to Congress, 713
Cost of living, causes of, 828; increase in, 718; must be reduced, 713
Counsel and judgment of various kinds, 284
Cuba, Honor in our withdrawal from, 199
Currency legislation urged upon Congress, 10, 39; benefits of new law, 306
Czechoslovakia, Austria must fulfill rights of, 540 (See also Peace Treaty: Weak Nations)

D

Daughters of American Revolution, Address to, 122
Defense, National:
Army expansion for war recommended upon basis of universal service, 376
Army insufficient for routine work of peace, 186, 194, 204
Army: Selective Draft Act, 395
Army: Selective Draft men, Message to, 424
Aviation Development in Navy, 185
Coast defenses, Efficiency of, 179; Lack of, 169
Industrial mobilization and expert citizen advice, 152, 206
Military training (universal, voluntary) recommended, 78, 129, 140, 186
Military training, advantages of, 161, 164, 178, 192, 213
Military training combined with vocational, 160, 164
Navy enlargement urged, 130, 140, 180
Navy: Fourth in quantity, second to none in quality, 170, 180, 184
Navy: Progress of enlargement plans, 184
Navy that ranks first in the world, 205
Navy: Vast coast guarding task, 203
Navy: What kind of ships shall we build? 79
National Defense first discussed in message, 76
National Guard commended and changes suggested, 130, 161, 171, 187
Preparedness not a money-making agitation, 179

Defense, National (cont'd):
Preparedness program outlined, 126; urged upon Congress, 139
Preparedness, Recognition of pressing nature of, 158, 167, 208
Sanitary lesson of Spanish War, 204
Universal military service recommended, 376
Democratic Congress, Appeal to voters to return, 557
Democratic party, Praise of, 82, 303
Democracy incompatible with armament, 771, 821, 870, 1108, 1127
Denver, Colo., Address at, 1100
Des Moines, Iowa, Address at, 788
Diplomatic notes:
As a neutral to belligerents, 215-270
Leading to the Armistice, 533-547
Relating to Adriatic problem, 1168-1183
Relating to Turkish peace, 1183
Directors, Individual responsibility of, 53
Directors, Interlocking boards condemned, 50
Disarmament, provided for in Naval appropriations bill, 875, 909, 944 (See also League of Nations; Peace Treaty)
Drummond, Sir James Eric, proposed as first Secretary General of League Council, 665

E

Economic boycott against Germany, after the war, a possibility, 448
Economic boycott, a weapon of the League of Nations, 748, 775, 779, 808, 841, 940, 1000, 1039
Economic necessity for peace, 996, 1030, 1048, 1111
Economy in Government expenditures urged, 4, 1217
Education, Vocational and industrial, legislation recommended, 342
Eight-hour law urged for railway operators, 294
Elections, Legislation recommended to regulate expenditure of money in, 341
Elections (State) of 1914, Interpretation of, 89
Embargo proclamations, 403
Employers' liability law for railway employees urged, 46
Entangling alliances, 1036
European addresses, 576-638, 659-692
European trip announced to Congress, 574
Exports, Regulation of, 403

F

Farm credits legislation urged upon Congress, 40
Farmer, Legislation benefitting, 306
Farmer, Price-fixing for benefit of, 401, 424
Farmer to be encouraged, 1143
Farmers, upon whom rests the fate of nations, 390
Federal Reserve Bank system created, 10
Federal Reserve Bank system, Good results from, 83, 284, 306
Federal Trade Commission (See Trade Commission)
Financial: Address at Pan American Financial Congress, 119
Fiume: to Italy, or Jugoslavia? 1168 (See also "Italy")
Flag Day address, 411
Food Control Act, 717, 720; should be continued, 1145
Food regulation program, 399
Foreign Relations Committee, consulted on League of Nations covenant, 959, 975
France:
Address to French Senate, 615
Greeting on Bastile Day, 419
Has "made waste paper of the treaty," 1233
Special treaty with, 710

G

Garfield, quoted, 899
Genoa, Italy, Address at, 602
Germany:
Armistice proposals, 533-547
"Bremen to Bagdad," 771, 816, 902, 994, 1105

Germany (cont'd):
Commercial rivalry cause of war, 770
Diplomatic correspondence with (See War)
Diplomatic relations severed, 358
Existence or independence not threatened by United States, 448
Government, Indictment of, 407, 412, 422, 445
Hopes America will stay out of peace treaty, 904, 964, 991, 1029, 1048, 1078, 1087, 1104
Industrial and educational achievement, 436, 447
Misled and debased, 786
Peace proposals, 533-547
People as rulers, 542
People, Did not want war, 881
People, No quarrel with, 362, 378, 382
Scheme for world conquest, 414, 437
War declaration advised, 372
War proclaimed with, 383
Gettysburg reunion, Address at, 14
Gompers, Samuel, commended, 439
Grain Dealers' Association, Address before, 327
Grand Army of the Republic, Address before veterans, 14
Great Britain, Diplomatic correspondence with (See War)
Great Britain's six votes in the League, 920, 977, 1021, 1045, 1059, 1095, 1119
Greece proposed as member of League Council, 666

H

Helena, Mont., Address at, 878
Hitchcock reservations accepted, 1166
Hoover, Herbert, appointed Food Administrator, 401
House, Col. E. M., sent to Europe, 439
Humes, France, Address at, 578
Hungary (See Austria-Hungary)

I

Immigration bill veto: first, 94; second, 356
Inaugural address: first, 1; second, 368
Indianapolis, Ind., Address at, 743
Industrial conference called, 1131; urged to agree, 1131
Industrial necessity for peace, 790, 995, 1036
Industrial readjustment, problems of, 564
Industrial unrest, 1148
Interlocking directorates condemned, 50
International court recommended by Congress in Naval appropriation bills, 875, 909, 944
International law: How it was built up, 374
International law in relation to League of Nations, 669, 896, 1064, 1090
International Law Society, Address before, 667
Interstate Commerce Commission, enlargement recommended, 299, 339
Ishii, Viscount, Welcome to, 419
Isolation impossible for America, 768, 859, 889, 904, 953, 1046, 1100, 1141
Italy:
Adriatic question, 659, 733, 1168
Fiume problem, 659, 733, 1168
Frontiers to be adjusted along lines of nationality, 469
Has "made waste paper of the treaty," 1233
Has underwritten civilization, 942

J

Jackson Day address at Indianapolis, 80
Jackson Day letter, 1161
Japan's special Ambassador, Welcome to, 419
Jugoslavia, Austria must fulfill rights of, 540
Jugoslavia, Dispute with Italy over Fiume, 659, 1168 (See also Peace Treaty: Weak Nations)

K

Kansas as a typical American community, 193
Kansas City, Mo., Address at, 777

L

Labour:
Address to American Federation of Labour, 434
Appointment of commission to adjust disputes, 427
Conciliation methods versus strikes, 440
Coal strike settlements, 1133, 1152, 1155, 1189, 1200, 1202
Conditions should be improved, 1147
Eight-hour day advocated for railway operators, 294
Federal employment bureau suggested, 87
Industrial conference called, 873, 1131
International bureau provided in League of Nations, 635, 1115
Labour pledges in speech accepting renomination, 317
Labour record of first Wilson administration, 307
(See also League of Nations)
Lamb, Charles, quoted, 440, 586
Latin-America: Actions taken by various countries against Germany, 432
Latin-America, Future commercial relations with, 32, 119, 136, 335
League of Nations:
Accepted as basis of peace with Central Powers, 706
America should enter, for economic advantage, 908, 1030, 1048; to defend principles of justice and right, 1024, 1127; to fulfill objects for which war was waged, 965; to guarantee peace, 654, 809, 1093; to justify faith of Europe, 923, 936, 943, 952; to preserve territorial integrity of world, 799; to prevent necessity of military preparedness, 821, 950, 1108, 1127
America will not be drawn into wars under Article X, 1071
An American conception, 931, 939
Arbitration and discussion, central principle of thirty treaties already entered into by U. S., 778, 824
League of Nations (cont'd):
Arbitration and discussion, principal means to prevent war, 744, 760, 775, 778, 802, 808, 840, 849, 929, 938, 998, 1025, 1038, 1117
"Armed isolation or peaceful partnership?" 773, 799, 844, 966, 1030
Article I [withdrawal from League], 811, 823, 877, 891, 914, 960, 976, 981, 1012, 1065, 1094
Article X [preservation of territorial integrity], 746, 765, 799, 809, 862, 891, 913, 941, 988, 1032, 1056, 1071, 1080, 1090, 1094, 1097, 1120, 1209
Article XI [presentation of peace the world's business], 752, 762, 841, 896, 922, 973, 1064, 1108, 1121
As a campaign issue, 1163, 1187, 1204, 1207
Assembly, constitution of, 1102, 1118; powers of, 1022, 1094
Council called to meet, 1165
Council, constitution of, 1118; powers of, 944, 984
Council, Sir James Drummond proposed as first Secretary General, 665
Council, unanimous vote required may delay activity of League, 1123; insures U. S. sovereignty, 915, 921, 975, 1022, 1095, 1102
Covenant, clarity of, 800
Covenant (revised), presented to Peace Conference, 663
Covenant, text of, 623
Dependence on public opinion, 634, 761, 999, 1116
Discussion opened at Peace Conference, 618
Domestic affairs not interfered with, 848, 894, 919, 1020, 1069, 1125
Enforcement by economic boycott, 748, 775, 779, 808, 841, 940, 1000, 1039; by combined action of mankind, 822, 1116
Great Britain's six votes, 920, 977, 1021, 1045, 1059, 1095, 1119
Guaranty against future war, 730, 809, 853, 897, 911, 929, 1013, 1025, 1081, 1129
International agreements must be made public, 636, 754, 763

League of Nations (cont'd):
International law affected by, 1108
International law problems presented, 669
Labour, International Bureau of, 635, 1115
Labour, Magna Charter of, 737, 791, 819, 854, 930, 946, 1009, 1016, 1109
Maintenance of justice, outgrowth of desire for, 689
Mandatory powers, 636
McKinley foresaw it, 1036
Membership only for self-governing nations, 852, 927, 1011, 1040
Monroe Doctrine affected, 893, 918, 932, 959, 1020, 1069, 1125
Necessary for present settlements and future maintenance of peace, 618, 730
Not a party issue, 648, 742, 751, 815, 916, 931-3, 1018, 1049
Object defined, 577
Peace of the world everybody's business (See Article XI)
Peace Treaty cannot be executed without, 654, 1092, 1101
Referendum asked, 1163, 1204
Representation, in body of delegates, 633, 920, 977, 1021, 1045, 1059, 1095, 1119
Republican party proposed it, 940
Republican pro-Leaguers addressed, 1207
Reservation to Article X rejects covenant, 1071, 1098
Reservations condemned, 1023, 1070
Revolution, right to, not interfered with by Article X, 766, 1080, 1094
Territorial integrity of nations, preserved (See Article X)
Trusteeships for states not ready for self-government, 738, 820, 842
Unanimous product of fourteen nations, 623, 632; not his own work, 916, 939, 980, 1018
Weak nations, protected, 760
Western speeches while covenant was before Senate, 727-1130
Withdrawal from (See Article I)
Liberty Loan Day designated, 430
Lincoln, Address on, at log-cabin birthplace, 319
Lincoln, Abraham, quoted, 1212
Lind, John, sent to Mexico as personal representative, 20
Lobby: Statement denouncing insidious influence on tariff legislation, 9
Lodge, Henry Cabot, quoted, 955, 1019
London, Addresses at, 576, 581, 583
Los Angeles, Calif., Addresses at, 1027, 1037

M

McKinley foresaw a league of nations, 1036
Manchester, England, Addresses at, 587, 590
Mandan, No. Dak., Address at, 866
Manhattan Club, New York, Address at, 125
Merchant marine (See Shipping)
Mesopotamia in the Turkish peace treaty, 1186
Mexico:
And friendship for, but not coercion, 136
American friendship for, 18
Americans urged to leave, 25
Arms-export prohibition (by Taft) continued, 25; removed, 55
Arms, Exports of, forbidden except to Carranga faction, 56
Congress asked for authority to use armed force against Huerta (Tampico incident), 62
Diplomatic note from Mexico, 22
How to help Mexico, 282
Huerta the unspeakable, 312
Huerta's claim of legal government, 23
Huerta's elimination demanded, 21
Intervention or war with Mexico, 276
Mexican sovereignty to be respected, 20
Mexicans entitled to settle domestic affairs in their own way, 62, 91, 312

Mexico (cont'd):
Pershing armed expedition, Reasons for sending, 311
Special message to Congress, 18
Special message to Congress on the Tampico incident, 59
"Watchful waiting" policy announced, 39
Middlemen should forego unusual profits during war, 390
Milan, Italy, Address at, 604
Militarism, A definition of, 159
Militarism, incompatible with democracy, 771, 821, 870, 1108, 1127
Mine labour conditions, Improvement of, 46
Minneapolis, Minn., Address at, 835
Monopolies (See Trusts and monopolies)
Monroe Doctrine, 198; should be extended to whole world, 355, 1069
Monroe Doctrine, why issued, 1052 (See also League of Nations)

N

National Army selected, 395
National Army, Message to, 426
National defense (See Defense)
National Guard (See Defense, National)
Naval appropriation bill of 1915 recommends an International court and disarmament, 875, 909, 944
Navy (See Defense, National)
Neutrals, Regulation of exports to, 403
New York City, Addresses at, 647, 694
New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad dissolution suit ordered, 63
News, True and false, 112
Newspaper editorials' lack of influence, 92, 193, 201
Non-partisanship of modern American politics, 82, 90

O

Oakland, Calif., Address at, 1005
Omaha, Neb., Address at, 803

P

Pacifists, Stupidity of, 439
Palestine in the Turkish peace treaty, 1186
Panama Canal tolls: Message to Congress urging repeal of free-tolls provision for American ships, 57
Pan-American Financial Congress, Address at, 119
Pan-Germanism: "Bremen to Bagdad," 771, 816, 902, 994, 1105
Party, Government by, 84, 90
Parties, Political (See Democratic, Republicans, Politics, etc.)
Peace:
Address (while a neutral) to Senate, on essential terms, 348
Advantage to Germany of premature peace, 416
Agreement must be guaranteed by German people, 424, 446, 538
Allied governments willing to consider, 546
America's cooperation necessary for, 861, 1058, 1075, 1093
An age of peace (ante-bellum statement), 37
Austria appeals for discussion of principles of, 533
Based on generosity and justice, 446, 662
Conference of Vienna in 1815, 1051
Desire of democracies, 137
Essential terms of world harmony, 348, 370
Formula: "No annexations, no indemnities," 445 (See also Peace Treaty: Principles)
League of Nations to avert future wars, 315, 350, 355, 470, 940, 1036
League of Nations (See League)
League to enforce peace, United States willing to become a member of, 274
Peace, League to Enforce, Address before, 271
Peace must be guaranteed by an international force, 351
Peace terms, 348, 407, 464, 548
"Peace without victory," 352
Political, social, economic necessity, 790, 995, 1036, 1111

Peace (cont'd):
Proposal (while a neutral) to belligerent governments, 343
Proposals by Germany and Austria, 535
Resolution vetoed, 1195
Right is more precious than peace, 382
Separate peace a disgrace, 991
Peace Conference; Speech proposing Clemenceau as chairman of, 614; speech opening discussion on League, 618; presenting revised covenant, 663
Peace Treaty:
Acceptance urged for America, 814, 825, 843, 860, 901, 923, 965, 967, 1030, 1074, 1093
America needed to guarantee peace, 1075, 1093
Boundaries settled, 804, 885
Disarmament accomplished, 780, 1107
Enforcement by League of Nations, 822, 1032
Extolled, 692, 1078
Industrial provisions affect U. S., 759, 858, 1111
Labour Conference, International, provided for, 1010
Labour provisions (see League of Nations)
League of Nations an essentail part of treaty, 1092, 1101
Made waste paper by France and Italy, 1233
Minor compromises, 709
Opponents "hyphenated" Americans, 1078, 1104, 1113
"People's peace," 1087
Presented to Senate, 698
Principles on which treaty is based, 858, 869, 1008, 1014, 1105
Essentially American, 795, 884, 967, 1028
New to treaty-making, 777, 806, 886, 912, 993, 1079
Ratification necessary to secure our war objects, 1162
Reservations not practicable, 909, 947, 961
Reservations as Pro-German propaganda, 1078
Reservations of Senator Hitchcock accepted, 1166
Standpat policy condemned, 792
Tasks performed by, 704, 840, 945, 1010, 1058
Peace Treaty (cont'd):
Terms severe but just, 728, 776, 807, 868
Text, 548
Treaties, secret, forbidden, 842
Waterways internationalized, 1009
Weak nations, protected, 760, 1015 (See also Peace Treaty: Principles)
Weak nations redeemed, 731, 742, 749, 757, 776, 783, 795, 805, 819, 885, 1006, 1015, 1079, 1114
Weak nations: rights of minorities recognized, 736; trusteeships for, 636, 820
Western speeches while treaty was before Senate, 727-1130
(See also League of Nations)
Pessoa, Epitacio, President-elect of Brazil, Address at dinner for, 682
Philippines:
America as trustee for, 199
Freedom safe for, under League of Nations, 786
Greater measure of self-government for, 71, 145
Independence recommended, 1220
Natives granted control of upper chamber, 44
Poland must be united, independent, autonomous, 353, 470
Poland must have access to sea, 450, 470
Poland (See also Peace Treaty: Weak nations)
Political asylum for foreign refugees should not be restricted, 95
Politics:
A definition of, 28
Independent voters' supremacy, 90
Non-partisanship of modern Americans, 82
Pope Benedict's peace proposals, Reply to, 421
Portland, Ore., Addresses at, 949, 955
Porto Rico, Changes in government urged, 43, 145, 341
"Preparedness" (See Defense, National)
Presidential primary law urged upon Congress, 43
Press Club, New York, Address before, 276
Price-fixing as part of food-regulation program, 401, 424

Price-fixing further recommended, 452
Progressive Party principles carried out by Democrats, 308
"Proud, Too, to fight," 117
Proverb, quoted, 691
Pueblo, Colo., Address at, 1113

R

Radio address, 1232
Railroad Business Association, Address before, 156
Railroads:
  Capital supervision, 51
  Government control begun, 455; ended, 1159
  New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad sued for dissolution of mergers, 63
  Presidential control proposed, over property and men, in case of military necessity, 301, 339
  Problem serious and pressing, 154
  Return to private ownership, 681
  Special message to Congress to avert threatened strike, 294; reference to railroad legislation in annual message, 337
  Statement of after-war problem, 570
  Systems must be developed and coordinated for national use, 317
  Wage demands and Congress, 1220 (See also Congress)
  Withdrawal of recommendation that Congress approves increase of freight rates to meet expense of eight-hour day, 339
Reclamation of arid lands, 567, 675
Red Cross, Address at dedication of Washington home, 392
Red Cross, Cooperation by school children proposed, 427
Reelection, Thinking about, renders reelection difficult, 30
Reno, Nevada, Address at, 1050
Renomination, Speech accepting, 302
Republican congress, a repudiation of leadership, 558
Republican party, Criticism of, 81, 304, 309, 1161, 1198, 1205
Resources, Natural, Development of, 45, 317, 452
Revenue: Further taxation urged, to cover "preparedness" expenditures, 145
Revenue: Special message urging additional revenue to meet decrease in customs, 64
Revolution, in 19th century, against autocracy, 1053
Revolution, Road away from, 1229
Revolution, right to, 766, 1080, 1094
Revolution, source of, 734; use of, 838
Rome, Italy, addresses at, 594, 596, 598
Roosevelt, Theodore, quoted, 1019, 1124
Rural credits (See Farm credits)
Russia:
  Always democratic at heart, 379
  Democracy endangered by Germany, 439, 450, 464
  In control of minority, 782, 839, 852, 948, 1151
  Interest in Turkish settlement, 1185
  Message to, 405
  National Council, Message to, 420

S

Safety at sea: Ratification of international convention urged, 73
Salesmanship Congress, Addresses at, 279
Salt Lake City, Utah, Address at, 1067
San Diego, Calif., Address at, 1014
San Francisco, Calif., Addresses at, 966, 979, 993
Seamen's act, advantages to labouring men, 1009
Seas, Freedom of (See under War)
Seattle, Wash., Address at, 936
Second Term (See Reelection)
Senate:
  Address on essential terms of peace, 348
  Address presenting peace treaty, 698
  Address urging adoption of woman suffrage resolution, 528
  Criticism of peace-treaty attitude, 1161

Serbia must have access to sea, 450, 470 (See also Jugoslavia and Peace Treaty: Weak nations)
Shantung, Japan will return sovereignty to China, 753, 1091
Shantung settlement, America should uphold, 763, 988, 1062, 1082
Shantung settlement, a necessary expedient, 798, 813, 895, 1121
Shantung settlement, history of, 970, 986, 1040, 1061, 1088
Sherman Anti-trust law retarding foreign commerce, 106
Sherman Anti-trust law should be supplemented, 42, 47, 52
Shipping, Lack of, 70
Shipping legislation urged upon Congress, 72
Shipping bill as remedy for extortionate ocean freight rates, 85
Shipping bill as remedy for dwindling merchant marine, 143, 334
Shipping readjustment after war, 565, 567
Silesia (See Peace Treaty: Weak nations)
Sioux Falls, So. Dak., Address at, 816
Soldiers' aid recommended, 1142, 1218
South America (See Latin-America)
Southern Commercial Congress, Address before, 32
Spain, proposed as member of first League Council, 666
Spanish War sanitary experience, 204
Spokane, Wash., Address at, 911
St. Louis, Mo., Addresses at, 754, 767
St. Paul, Minn., Addresses at, 828, 844
Strike, Rights to, is inviolate, 1150
Supreme War Council, assurances to peoples of Central Europe, 554
Suresnes, visit to the cemetery of, 1128
Syria in the Turkish peace treaty, 1186

T

Tacoma, Wash., Address at, 924
Tariff bill vetoed, 1224
Tariff, protective (Republican), Evils of, 7, 304
Tariff revision urged upon Congress, 5; its tendency to encourage foreign trade, 305; needed to safeguard against hostile legislation, 680
Tariff, no need for increase, 678
Tariff Commission:
  Conversion in favor of, 158
  Bipartisan membership, 288
  What it is expected to accomplish, 316, 332
  Report of, 680
Tax revision recommended, 1217
Taxation, to help sustain war costs, 377
Taxation must be determined for 1918-20, 568
Taxation should be adjusted to sustain credit and enterprise, 676
Telegraph and telephone lines, return to private ownership, 680
Thanksgiving proclamation, 433
Trade (See Commerce)
Trade Commission:
  How it has relieved business, 306, 331
  Power to investigate tariff questions, 89
  Recommended to Congress, 52
  Why it was established, 28, 315
Treaties (See separate nations; also arbitration treaties)
Treaty of Peace (See Peace Treaty)
Trusts and monopolies, Message to Congress on, 47
Turin, Italy, Address at, 608
Turkey:
  Controlled by Germany, 437, 447
  Fall of, 704
  Peace terms, 1114, 1183
  Solution of political and race problems, 470

U

United States (See America and Americans; also under War)
United States Chamber of Commerce, Address before, 103
United States soldiers, Address delivered at Hume, France, to, 578

Universal military training and service (See Defense, National)
University of Paris, Address upon receiving degree of Doctor Honoris Causa, 576
Unrest, propaganda of, being disseminated throughout the world, 789, 872
Unrest and disorder, universal, 871, 935, 947

V

Veto of Emergency Tariff bill, 1224
Veto of Immigration bill; first 94, second, 356
Veto of Peace resolution, 1195
Vienna, Peace conference of, 1051
Voters, Appeal to, 557

W

War:
Alliances must give way to common agreement, 273
Allied governments will make peace and communicate terms of armistice, 56
America alone at peace and keeping its head, 93, 133, 181, 183
America as a belligerent, 376
America may become involved, 172, 210
America more indispensable at peace than to either side if at war, 198
America not at first ready for war, 1028
America seeks no indemnities, no material compensation, 381, 406
America should participate without interfering with supplies for nations already in field, 377
America's determination to use every resource and win, 446
America's interest in European peace, 349
America's objects in entering war, 406, 464, 622, 642, 1054
America's desire that President should "keep us out of war," 173, 189, 201, 880
America's part to supply food, ships, raw and manufactured materials, 388
War (cont'd):
Ancona case, 254
Arabic case, 253
Armaments, Limitations of, 354, 371
Armed neutrality suggested, 365; declared impracticable, 375
Armistice: Proposal of Germany to be taken up with Allies, 543
Austria, Note to, regarding *Ancona* sinking, 254
Austria-Hungary: Offers separate peace, 545; Peace proposal must satisfy rights of Czecho-Slovaks and Jugo-Slavs, 540
Between governments, never between peoples, 177
Brazil joins Allies, 432
British blockade, Notes relating to, 225, 227, 229
British blockade declared illegal, 234; ineffective, illegal and indefensible, 237
Caused by commercial and industrial rivalries, 771; Pan-Germanism: "Bremen to Bagdad," 816, 902, 994, 1105
Cost, 926, 1003
Cushing case, 239, 244
Declaration of London, Suggested observance of, 215
Diplomatic correspondence with belligerents, 215-270, 533-547
Falaba case, 239, 245
Finances of United States, 430
Flag: Unwarranted use of American emblem by British ships, 223
German submarine pledges, 253, 268
Germans in the United States, alien enemy regulations, 383, 451
Germany, America demands guarantees from, 538
Germany, Armistice proposed to be taken up with Allies, 543
Germany, Diplomatic relations severed, 358
Germany, First Peace Proposal, 535; reply to, asks pointed questions, 536; answered, 538
Germany, Long prepared for war, 816
Germany, Proclamation of state of war with, 383

War (cont'd):
Germany, Refusal to discuss British - American relations with, 270
Germany, Threat to sever diplomatic relations with, 262
Germany, War declaration advised, 372
Gulflight case, 239, 244
Loans of United States, 430
Lusitania notes to Germany, 239, 244, 249
Merchant ships, Arming of, 265, 375
Merchant ships, Congress asked for authority to arm, 383
Nation, not an army, trained for war, 397
Neutral nation, Difficulties of a, 196, 310, 315
Neutrality appeal to Americans, 217
Neutrality no longer feasible or desirable, 378
Number of men lost, 926
Objects for which it is waged. Plea for precise statement of, 347
Objects for which it is waged, A statement of, 422, 838
Objects of America in entering war, 406, 464, 622, 642, 1054
Peace terms (See Peace)
Profit from war industries should be small, 391
Property rights can be vindicated by damage claims, rights of humanity cannot, 310
Right of Americans to travel on the seas, 196 (See also German and submarine note references)
Right of Americans to trade with the world, 197 (See also British blockade references)
Reduction of armaments by Treaty of Peace, 704
Seas, Freedom of, 353, 371, 450, 468
War (cont'd):
Submarine, American notes protesting against, 220, 239, 244, 249, 257, 269
Submarine and blockade compromise proposal of United States, 226
Submarines "manifestly cannot be used against merchantmen," 241; "possible and practicable to conduct such submarine operations," 251; "use of submarines for destruction of commerce utterly incompatible with principles of humanity," 262
Submarine war-zone protest to Germany, 220
Submarine war against merchant ships renewed by Germany, 358
Sussex case (note to Germany), 257; (address to Congress), 262
Territorial conquests and punitive damages condemned, 407, 424
Treaty of Peace (See Peace Treaty)
United States (See War: America)
Visit - and - search principles, 221
Western Hemisphere must be kept out, 168
Washington, George, Brief characterization of, 29
"Watchful waiting" Mexican policy announced, 39
Water-power development urged, 70
Wines and beer, ban upon manufacture of, should be removed, 681
Woman Suffrage:
Address at convention, 323
Letter to Tennessee Governor, 1199
Plea for the Amendment, 528, 563, 680
Workmen's compensation (See Employers' liability)
"World must be made safe for democracy," 381